

THE GODDESS ANAT

**AN EXAMINATION OF THE TEXTUAL
AND ICONOGRAPHIC EVIDENCE FROM THE
SECOND MILLENNIUM B.C.**

by

JEFFERY B. LLOYD

Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Hebrew and Old Testament Studies
University of Edinburgh
1994



TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	i
DEDICATION	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ABBREVIATIONS.....	v
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER ONE: EARLY HISTORY AND ETYMOLOGY	7
CHAPTER TWO: EVIDENCE FROM EGYPT.....	63
CHAPTER THREE: ANAT IN THE ILIMILKU TEXTS.....	137
CHAPTER FOUR: OTHER MYTHICAL TEXTS	256
CHAPTER FIVE: UGARITIC CULTIC TEXTS.....	321
CONCLUSIONS.....	369
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	374

DECLARATION

This dissertation is in fulfilment of the requirements established by the University of Edinburgh, for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Hebrew and Old Testament Studies. The composition is entirely my own work, and all contributions from other authors have been clearly indicated.

Jeffery Brian Lloyd

28 February 1994

*To my parents and to Carolyn
for their support and encouragement
and above all
for their love*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my thanks to my supervisor Dr N. Wyatt for the guidance and support he has given me over the course of my studies. His constant attention to detail and welcome comments have helped to keep me on the straight and narrow. I also thank him for his friendship. I also owe a debt of gratitude to Professor J.C.L. Gibson who read parts of this dissertation and provided me with constructive comments on my text. My thanks also go out to the staff at New College Library for their friendly service and the great help they have been in finding the sources that have eluded me.

Finally, my heartfelt thanks go to my wife, Dr Carolyn Lloyd, for her support over the last four years, while she worked full time and completed her own PhD.

NOTE

The many references in the text to colour slides of the Ugaritic tablets all refer to the excellent collection of Dr N. Wyatt, who has several hundred images of the most important mythic texts. My thanks to him for letting me use them for my dissertation.

ABSTRACT

This dissertation begins with an examination of texts from Mari dating to the early second millennium B.C., mainly in the form of cultic lists, which provide us with the earliest evidence for a cult of Anat. Since much of the evidence comes to us in the form of her divine name used as part of theophoric personal names, a comparison is made between Mari personal names and those from Ugarit which include the divine element 'Anat'. An investigation is also made into the various etymologies proposed for the divine name in an attempt to ascertain information on her earliest nature.

Attention is then focused on the character of Anat from New Kingdom Egypt where we find she had a close relationship with the kings of the nineteenth dynasty, and Ramesses II in particular. From the inscriptional, iconographic and literary evidence we are able to obtain a far more detailed picture of her character in Egyptian theology than from Mari, and a comparison is made between this Egyptian Anat and what we know of her character from Ugarit. Thanks to the iconographic evidence from Egypt which often provides the names of the deities it portrays, the opportunity is taken to examine all the major 'anonymous' pieces which have been claimed to represent Anat, mostly from Syria-Palestine, and to compare them with the Egyptian portrayals. An attempt is made to evaluate the claims for such identification, and the tenuous nature of making such claims is discussed.

Finally, the investigation turns to the greatest body of evidence which can be brought to bear on the character of Anat - the texts from Ugarit. After a discussion of her titles and epithets from which we obtain a 'skeleton' of her character, the study proceeds to examine her character and role as it is developed in Ugaritic myth. All of the relevant material is translated and comparisons between texts, both within the corpus of Ugaritic material itself and references external to Ugarit, are handled in a way that remains sensitive to the complex issue of context in which the references are found. Recent studies on the character of Anat, which often rely on a reconstruction taken from many disparate sources and melded together irrespective of context, are assessed in the light of these new translations. Hand in hand with the mythic texts which are a rich source for our understanding of the character of Anat are the cultic texts such as god-lists and offering-lists, which give us a direct insight into the Ugaritic cult of Anat. Therefore, these texts are also examined and a comparison is made between her mythic role, and her status in the cult.

ABBREVIATIONS

AF	<i>Anuari de Filogia</i>
AHw	von Soden (1965-1981) <i>Akkadisches Handwörterbuch</i>
akk.	Akkadian
AJBA	<i>Australian Journal of Biblical Archaeology</i>
AJSL	<i>American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures</i>
ANEP	Pritchard (1954) <i>The Ancient Near East in Pictures Relating to the Old Testament</i>
ANET	Pritchard (1969) <i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament</i>
AO	<i>Analecta Orientalia</i>
ar.	Arabic
aram.	Aramaic
ARM 1	Dossin (1950) <i>Correspondance de Šamši-Addu et ses fils</i>
ARM 4	Dossin (1951) <i>Correspondance de Šamši-Addu et de ses fils (Suite)</i>
ARM 6	Kupper (1954) <i>Correspondance de Bahdi-Lim Préfet du Palais de Mari</i>
ARM 7	Bottéro (1957) <i>Textes Économiques et Administratifs</i>
ARM 8	Boyer (1958) <i>Textes Juridiques</i>
ARM 11	Burke (1963) <i>Textes Administratifs de la Salle 111 du Palais</i>
ARM 13	Dossin et al. (1964) <i>Textes Divers</i>
ARM 14	Birot (1974) <i>Lettres de Yaqqim-Addu Gouverneur de Sagarâtum</i>
ARM 16/1	Birot et al. (1979) <i>Répertoire Analytique II: Tomes I-XIV, XVIII et Textes Divers Hors-Collection</i>
ARM 18	Rouault (1978) <i>MUKANNIŠUM: L'administration et l'économie palatiales à Mari</i>
ARM 21	Durand (1983) <i>Texts Administratifs des Salles 134 et 160 du Palais de Mari</i>
ARM 22	Kupper (1983) <i>Documents administratifs de la salle 135 du Palais de Mari</i>
ARM 23	Bardet et al. (1984) <i>Archives Administratives de Mari I</i>
ARM 24	Talon (1985) <i>Textes Administratifs des salles «Y et Z» du Palais de Mari</i>
ARM 25	Limet (1986) <i>Textes Administratifs relatifs aux Métaux</i>
ARTU	De Moor (1987) <i>An Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit</i>
ASAE	<i>Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte</i>
AuOr	<i>Aula Orientalis</i>
BA	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
BASOR	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
BDB	Brown et al. (1979) <i>The New Brown-Driver-Briggs-Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon: With an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic</i>
BHS	Rudolph and Rieger (1977) <i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i>
BIFAO	<i>Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'archaeologie orientale du Caire</i>
BiOr	<i>Bibliotheca Orientalis</i>
BZ	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
CAD	Gelb et al. (1956-) <i>The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago</i>
CARTU	De Moor and Spronk (1987) <i>A Cuneiform Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit</i>
CML	Driver (1956) <i>Canaanite Myths and Legends</i>
CML2	Gibson (1978) <i>Canaanite Myths and Legends</i>
CRAIBL	<i>Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres</i>
CTA	Herdner (1963) <i>Corpus des Tablettes en Cunéiformes Alphabétiques: Découvertes à Ras Shamra-Ugarit de 1929 à 1939</i>

DCH	Clines (1993-) <i>The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew</i>
EA	Knudtzon (1915) <i>Die El-Amarna Tafeln: Mit Einleitung und Erläuterungen</i>
EI	<i>Eretz Israel</i>
eth.	Ethiopic
GK	Kautzsch (1910) <i>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar</i>
HAL	Kochler and Baumgartner (1983) <i>Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexicon zum Alten Testament</i>
hb.	Hebrew
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
hurr.	Hurrian
IEJ	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
JANES	<i>Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Studies</i>
JAOS	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JEA	<i>Journal of Egyptian Archaeology</i>
JNES	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
JNSL	<i>Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages</i>
JPOS	<i>Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society</i>
JQR	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
JSAA	<i>Journal of the Society of Archer-Antiquities</i>
JSS	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
KAI	Donner and Röllig (1971-76) <i>Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften</i>
LÄ	Helck and Otto (1975-92) <i>Lexikon der Ägyptologie</i>
LXX	Septuagint
MARI	<i>MARI: Annuaire des Recherches Inter-Disciplinaires</i>
MLC	Del Olmo Lete (1981) <i>Mitos y Leyendas de Canaan: Segun la Tradicion de Ugarit</i>
MT	Masoretic Text
MUSJ	<i>Melanges de l'Universite Sainte-Joseph Beyrouth</i>
Or	<i>Orientalia</i>
phoen.	Phoenician
PIBI	<i>Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Institute</i>
PLMU	Gordon (1977) <i>Poetic Legends and Myths from Ugarit</i>
PRU 3	Nougayrol (1955) <i>Textes Accadiens et Hourrites des Archives Est, Ouest et Centrales</i>
PRU 4	Nougayrol (1956) <i>Textes Accadiens des Archives Sud</i>
RA	<i>Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie Orientale</i>
RB	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
RE	<i>Revue d'Égypte</i>
RHR	<i>Revue de l'Histoire des Religions</i>
SEL	<i>Studi Epigrafici e Linguistici</i>
SJOT	<i>Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament</i>
SP	De Moor (1971) <i>The Seasonal Pattern in the Ugaritic Myth of Balu: According to the Version of Ilmilku</i>
ST	<i>Studia Theologica</i>
syr.	Syriac
TEO1	Bordreuil and Pardee (1989) <i>La Trouvaille Epigraphique de L'Ougarit: 1. Concordance</i>
TOu1	Caquot et al. (1974) <i>Textes Ougaritiques: Tome 1: Mythes et Légendes, Introduction, Traduction, Commentaire</i>
TOu2	Caquot et al. (1989) <i>Textes Ougaritiques: Tome II. Textes Religieux et Rituels; Correspondance</i>

TRU	Xella (1981) <i>I Testi Rituali de Ugarit - I</i>
UF	<i>Ugarit-Forschungen</i>
ug.	Ugaritic
UT	Gordon (1965) <i>Ugaritic Textbook</i>
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	<i>Supplements to Vetus Testamentum</i>
WAS	Ermann and Grapow (1926-63) <i>Wörterbuch der Aegyptischen Sprache</i>
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZDMG	<i>Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft</i>

INTRODUCTION

The prominent role of the goddess Anat in the Baal Cycle and the Aqhat narrative presents us with a striking figure from Late Bronze Age Ugaritic myth. The picture of her hacking off heads and hands and wading through the blood and gore of those she has just slain, and the complex scheme she devises to murder Aqhat in order to get her hands on his composite bow, are at once both fascinating and disturbing, leaving a strong impression in the mind of the reader. At times she threatens to overshadow other important characters in the narratives such as Baal, Athirat, or even El himself. She is presented as a character whose dynamic vitality within the narratives is manifested in a personality which is surprisingly independent, exemplified in the threats she issues against El, the head of the Ugaritic pantheon.

However, if we were to focus only on this facet of her character we would overlook the richness and complexity of her personality with which she is depicted in the narratives. She demonstrates great concern for the welfare of Baal, mediating between him and her father El. When Baal has descended into the underworld, she mourns over his death along with El, and searches for his body, weeping when she comes upon it. It is also with Anat that we find a scene of immense pathos in the description of her yearning for her dead brother Baal (1.6.ii).

It is surprising, in view of the strength of her personality presented in these myths, that so few monographs have been dedicated to this goddess. Virolleaud's book length study (1938) came after a series of articles on Anat, but progress of our understanding of the Ugaritic texts has superseded this pioneering work. The first dissertation dedicated to Anat was that of Eaton (1964) who set about the task of drawing together all the available information on the goddess. He began with the Akkadian texts from Mari and carried his study through to the late first millennium Aramaic material, covering Egyptian, Ugaritic and Hebrew material on the way. The importance of his work should not be underestimated, since it was the first attempt to draw such a large body of disparate material together into a single study,

achieving all of this within the space of 125 pages. I am not advocating that we judge a book by its thickness, but Eaton's work draws together such a large volume of material that there is little room for detailed discussion within the confines of his dissertation; we see this, for example, in the fact that he did not attempt a translation of the Ugaritic texts but rather relied upon contemporary translations to analyse various aspects of Anat's character. Thus, although Eaton's work is of primary importance in gathering together the data for an investigation of Anat, it still leaves room for discussion on almost every aspect that he addressed.

Five years later came the study of Kapelrud (1969). This small scale study, a little over a hundred pages, promised to provide a detailed analysis of the character of the goddess in the Ras Shamra (i.e. Ugaritic) texts. However, although he provides a fairly comprehensive discussion of the goddess' character in the Ugaritic myths, the translations he offers are seldom given sufficient philological basis to be authoritative, and his assessments are often at a level that is too superficial for his work to be of lasting interest in the history of the study of Anat.

In 1971 the first English language edition of Cassuto's *Hā-'Ēlā 'Ānāth* (*The Goddess Anath*) became available, twenty years after its first publication in Hebrew. This valuable work provided many fresh insights into the study of Ugaritic literature and its relationship with that of Hebrew. However, despite the title, this was not a monograph dedicated to a study of Anat *per se*, but a translation and commentary on tablets V AB (KTU 1.3) and VI AB (KTU 1.1) and some various fragments. Already by the time of its publication into English it was considered as being dated, but it contains valuable observations on philology, and a detailed description of the tablets themselves, that makes this work well worth consultation.

The next study dedicated to Anat came in the dissertation of Bowman (1978). Unlike Eaton and Kapelrud before him, Bowman began with a translation of

all the Ugaritic texts in which we find the goddess Anat, beginning with the Baal Cycle and ending with various 'miscellaneous' texts. He then turned his attention to a study of her epithets, before dedicating chapters to Anat in Mesopotamia, in Palestine, Syria and Greece, in Egypt, and in Aramaic evidence. In scope this was equal to Eaton, excepting the latter's iconographical study, but was over double the length of the earlier work. This dissertation is a valuable source for the study of Anat, bringing together a vast amount of information and updating the earlier work of Eaton. However, the work is marred by Bowman's approach to the Ugaritic texts which is dominated by the fertility cult theory, to the extent that he attempts to interpret every action of Anat in terms of its potential for aiding Baal in producing his fertilising rain. On page 263 he concludes that Anat is a violent goddess and that this *must have fulfilled some function in the cult*. Bowman's overriding theory that Anat's violence was directly related to Baal's function to provide fertility through the rain, distorts his interpretation of the texts to such an extent that when discussing Anat in the Aqhat narrative, for example, he dismisses this narrative as unable to provide any significant data on Anat's character (106) because she is not depicted as working to promote Baal's fertility! With judgements such as these, and with the cursory interpretations he gives for each of the passages translated, coupled with his use of the fertility cult theory, Bowman's work is one that should be treated with much caution.

Such was the state of scholarship on the goddess Anat at the time the present work was begun. It was obvious that a study on the scale of Eaton and Bowman, although valuable as a source of data for further study, would be severely restricted in the amount of discussion that could be entered into. On the other hand, it was felt that any study that concentrated solely on the Ugaritic evidence, which is by far the most important for a proper understanding of the goddess' character, would have to take a proper account of the evidence for the history of her cult and its diversity in neighbouring areas. Thus it was felt that a study which restricted itself to

evidence dating from the second millennium B.C. would strike the correct balance between the volume of data that would need to be examined, and the need for an analysis of that data.

A second problem that became clear from reading earlier work on this goddess was the unhesitating use that was made of data from disparate cultures to supplement her character. There did not seem to be any barrier in time or space to the use of material from Mesopotamia, or Egypt, for example, to reconstruct Anat's Ugaritic character in those areas where our knowledge was incomplete. Therefore it was decided that this study would attempt to hold data from different cultures separately, and only once a picture of the goddess was built up for that specific body of data, would comparisons be drawn between different traditions. In this way it was hoped that what was specifically Egyptian, for example, would not become confused into a general picture of Anat that incorporated all the material but that was indigenous to no single tradition.

Two years into this project saw the publication of a further dissertation which concentrated on the goddess Anat. Neal Walls' *The Goddess Anat in Ugaritic Myth* was published in 1992 and promised to be a milestone in the history of research on this goddess. As its title suggests, Walls concentrates specifically on Anat as she is depicted in the Ugaritic texts, although extensive use is made of comparative material. Walls attempts to go beyond a simple philological analysis of the texts to approach the mythical meanings embedded in the narratives, which give us the clues to reconstruct the character of Anat. After his introduction, he devotes over sixty pages to a carefully developed analysis of comparative material that can be used to achieve a greater understanding of Anat's character. This excellent study forms an interesting forward to his analysis of the goddess in the remainder of his book; however, when we come to the study of the Ugaritic material itself, there are many problems of interpretation at both the level of philology and at the narrative level. Walls' often

astute observations are sometimes negated by his attempt to pursue his dominating thesis that the goddess Anat was a virgin goddess, who never engaged in sexual intercourse with Baal, and who was an “adolescent tomboy”. Rather than present a developed criticism of Walls’ thesis here, the many points of disagreement between us are discussed in the following chapters. However, with all this being said, his study is full of illumination and is an essential part of any study of the goddess Anat today.

In the following work I present material from Mari, Egypt and Ugarit as the three main centres from which we find substantial evidence for worship of this goddess. The texts from Ugarit provide us with the best picture of Anat worship in the second millennium, and the material from this ancient city is large enough to warrant three separate chapters. The first deals with the important collection of texts known to come from the hand of the scribe Ilimilku where we find Anat in the Baal Cycle and Aqhat narrative. This is followed by a chapter on other mythical texts and fragments in which Anat plays a part. Finally, an examination is made of the cultic texts in order to compare how Anat was perceived in cult and myth. Throughout, I have attempted to keep different categories of material separate, my intention is to investigate the picture of the goddess that emerges from the different traditions.

CHAPTER ONE

EARLY HISTORY AND ETYMOLOGY

1.1. Introduction	10
1.2. The Divine Name From Mari to Ugarit	11
1.2.1. Anat at Mari and in other Old Babylonian Sources	12
1.2.1.1. The Divine Name in Sacrificial Lists	13
1.2.1.1.1. Dossin (1950)	13
1.2.1.1.2. ARM 23.255	18
1.2.1.1.3. ARM 23.279	18
1.2.1.1.4. ARM 22.229	19
1.2.1.1.5. ARM 21.110	19
1.2.1.2. Personal Names	21
1.2.1.2.1. <i>ab-du-^dha-na-at</i>	21
1.2.1.2.2. <i>ba-lu-^ha-na-at</i>	21
1.2.1.2.3. <i>ha-ab-du-^dha-na-at</i>	21
1.2.1.2.4. <i>^fha'-mi-^dha-na-at</i>	22
1.2.1.2.5. <i>ha-na-t[i]-e-ba-al</i>	22
1.2.1.2.6. <i>ha-na-ti-l-ba-al</i>	22
1.2.1.2.7. <i>ha-na-tum</i>	22
1.2.1.2.8. <i>^dha-na-at-um-mi</i>	22
1.2.1.2.9. <i>ka-bi-^dha-na-at</i>	23
1.2.1.2.10. <i>mu-ut-^dha-na-at</i>	23
1.2.1.2.11. <i>šilli-^dha-na-at</i>	23
1.2.1.2.12. <i>um-mi-^dha-na-at</i>	23
1.2.1.2.13. <i>zi-ik-ri-^dha-na-at</i>	24
1.2.1.3. Old Babylonian Personal Names	24
1.2.1.3.1. <i>bu-nu-a-na-ti</i>	24
1.2.1.3.2. <i>bur-a-na-te</i>	25
1.2.1.3.3. <i>mu-ti-a-n(a-t)a</i>	25
1.2.1.3.4. <i>zi-im-ri-^ha-na-ta</i>	25
1.2.1.4. Conclusions	25
1.2.2. Anat in Ugaritic Personal Names	26
1.2.2.1. Syllabic Cuneiform Texts	27
1.2.2.1.1. <i>^labdi-a-na-ti</i>	27
1.2.2.1.2. <i>^labdi-an-tüti</i>	28
1.2.2.1.3. <i>^fa-na-ti-um-me</i>	29
1.2.2.1.4. <i>šu-um-a-na-ti</i>	29
1.2.2.1.5. <i>ⁿAN-IGI^{at}</i>	29
1.2.2.2. Alphabetic Cuneiform Texts	31
1.2.2.2.1. <i>il'nt</i>	31
1.2.2.2.2. <i>bn'nt</i>	31
1.2.2.2.3. <i>'bd'nt</i>	32
1.2.2.2.4. <i>glm'nt</i> or <i>šm'nt</i>	32
1.2.2.3. Conclusions	33
1.3. The Etymology of 'nt	33
1.3.1. 'Providence, Will'	33
1.3.1.1. Excursus: Anat at Elephantine	38

1.3.2.	'Providence, Will' (cont.)	48
1.3.3.	'Spring, Source, Well'	49
1.3.4.	'Humiliate, Oppress, Do violence to, Torment'	52
1.3.5.	'Stream of tears, Dirge'	53
1.3.6.	'To Love, Make Love'	55
1.3.7.	'Furrow'	58
1.3.8.	Conclusions	59
1.4.	Conclusions	61

1.1. INTRODUCTION

My assessment of the character of the goddess Anat in the second millennium B.C. begins with an understanding of the earliest historical context in which this goddess can be placed,¹ for it is only when we have certain evidence of her 'roots', and hence the linguistic and cultural milieu of her origins, that we are in a strong position to judge the merits of each theory. However, I am not suggesting that the goddess was necessarily 'born' in the culture for which we have the earliest written evidence,² merely that this has to be the starting point for our investigation. In what follows I will present the evidence for the worship of a goddess (*h*)*a-na-at* from the earliest written documentation, which happens to be from Mari, down to the presence of the goddess '*nt*' in the pantheon of Ugarit. Whilst we cannot be certain of there being any relationship between the goddess of these cultures, they share the same name and it is a fairly safe working hypothesis to assume that there is a connection and that they ultimately share common roots, although this is not to presuppose anything about their characters at Mari and Ugarit.

The earliest material comes from Mari, and consists solely of references to the divine name in god lists, offering lists, etc., as well as being the divine element in many theophoric personal names. I will present all of the material known at the present time in order to give an indication of the varied contexts in which this divine name occurs. References to Anat apart from those from Mari, are very scarce, limited to a few Old Babylonian theophoric personal names which will also be presented. In

¹'Historical' is used in the sense of linguistic, and hence written, evidence for the worship of the goddess Anat.

²The knowledge that her name belongs to the Semitic lexicon does not necessarily entail a knowledge of the *culture* in which she was first worshipped, since a culture is vastly more complex than its linguistic inheritance.

contrast, the goddess Anat plays a prominent role in the material from Ugarit where she is included in myths, pantheon lists, offering lists, etc., and also in personal names from this period. As a first step in our investigation I shall present the Akkadian material and discuss Anat's inclusion in Akkadian personal names. I shall compare them with Ugaritic personal names, and finally discuss the various etymologies that have been proposed for the name of Anat.

1.2. THE DIVINE NAME FROM MARI TO UGARIT

Scholars recognised Anat as a goddess without knowing very much about her character long before the spectacular discoveries made at the site of ancient Ugarit (e.g. de Vogüé 1868); however, our clearest insight into her character comes from the texts excavated at Ras Shamra. Half a century before the discoveries at Ras Shamra, Eduard Meyer (1877) critically discussed the proliferating identifications between this goddess and a host of other similarly named deities from the ancient Near East, bringing philological order to scholarly confusion. Albright, in his *The Evolution of the West Semitic Divinity 'An-'Anat-'Atta* (1925), put forward his influential views on the evolution of the divine name a full five years before the first Ugaritic tablets were unearthed. The present lack of scholarly consensus on the character and role of the goddess, even with the benefit of Ugaritic mythic narratives to guide us, has resulted in a wide diversity of opinion on the etymology of the divine name. More recent archaeological excavation, notably at Mari, has considerably broadened our knowledge of the history of the worship of Anat, although little has been found beyond the mundane inclusion of her name in various lists that would allow us to flesh out her character at Mari. This widening of the historical context of Anat worship aids us in our search for the etymology of the divine name, and it is in this light that I shall

begin my analysis of the divine name with a brief review of the earliest recorded material relating to the veneration of Anat.

1.2.1. Anat at Mari and in other Old Babylonian Sources

The earliest literary reference to Ugarit (*U₉-ga-ra-at^{ki}*) at present comes from Ebla in a list of 289 cities dated to the 24th century B.C. (TM.75.G.2231.I.5 Pettinato 1978; Liverani 1979 1296); however, as far as I am aware, no mention has yet been found of the goddess Anat at Ebla, not as part of a divine name, nor a personal name, nor a geographic name.³ Matthiae's (1980 138; 1984 22) identification of Anat on a Mardikh IIIB cylinder seal standing alongside Hadad is an intriguing possibility, but has no supporting evidence to commend it. Ugarit, as a geographic name and ethnic label, appears several times in the archives excavated at Tell el-Ḥariri (ancient Mari).⁴ Discovered in 1933, Mari, situated mid-way along the Euphrates, was a predominantly Amorite city-state during the early 18th century B.C. when it reached the height of its influence and power under the reign of Zimrilim.⁵ Subsequent archaeological excavations have recovered in excess of twenty thousand cuneiform tablets from some of the many rooms of the palace of Zimrilim (Dossin 1938), giving a *terminus ad quem* for their composition of c.1760 B.C.⁶ One of the more interesting

³A scrutiny of the indices of the following sources reveals no mention of Anat: Edzard (1981), Archi and Biga (1982), Pomponio (1983), Biga and Milano (1984), Edzard (1984), Archi (1985), Sollberger (1986), Archi (1988), Krebern timer (1988). For a well balanced popular introduction to Ebla and the controversy surrounding its interpretation, see Bermant and Weitzman (1979). Two first hand accounts of the site and its epigraphic finds are provided by Matthiae (1980) and Pettinato (1981).

⁴*U₉-ga-ri-tim*; *U₉-ga-ri-it^{ki}*. *Inter alia* ARM 25.43.7'; 46, side; 60.3'; 118.33; 154.17; 303.3; 340.tr.4; 359.5'; and the references given in ARM 16/1.

⁵Recent studies on Mari include Dalcy (1984), Malamat (1989). On the Amorites see Kenyon (1966), Haldar (1971), Liverani (1973), and Mendenhall (1992) with bibliography.

⁶Using the 'middle' chronology. The date for the accession of Hammurabi (a contemporary of Zimrilim who destroyed Mari) is dependent on the interpretation of

occurrences which gives us a tantalising impression of international relations is found in a letter sent to Zimrilim from Hammurapi, king of Yamḥad (Liverani 1979 1297), concerning the desire of the king of Ugarit, written in line 5 as *awīl U-ga-ri-it^[ki]*, to visit the famous palace at Mari (Schaeffer 1939 16 n.2). From a much later period (late 13th to early 12th century) we find a letter at Ugarit (RS 34.142) which was probably sent from Mari to a commercial contact in Ugarit concerning a transaction of horses (Lackenbacher 1984). It is at Mari then that we find our first historical evidence for the worship of the goddess Anat. Orthographically her name appears predominantly with an initial *h*; this is a feature of Amorite phonetics which represents ‘with *h*, at the beginning, in the middle and at the end of words (Jean 1950 70; Oldenburg 1969 83, Fronzaroli 1977 150; Hallo and Tadmor 1977 4). As a divine name, it is regularly preceded with the semantic classifier DINGIR (= *ilu* ‘god’), and this is also the case when it is part of personal names and geographical names.

1.2.1.1. The Divine Name in Sacrificial Lists

The goddess ^dHanat takes her place alongside many other deities in several sacrificial lists from Mari; the most extensive is that published by Dossin (1950).

1.2.1.1.1. Dossin (1950)

- 1 *6 immerâtum [a]-na niqêṁ (=ZUR-ZUR-RI)*
a-na ^dNin-é-gal
- 2 *immerâtum a-na ^dŠamaš ša ša-me-e*

astronomical observation of the planet Venus recorded during his reign, giving rise to several possibilities. Dalley (1984) accepts the ‘long’ chronology which places the accession of Hammurabi in 1848 B.C., whereas in Crawford’s (1991 20) more recent estimation, “most scholars now favour the middle date of 1792”, i.e. the middle chronology. This latter chronology dates the destruction of Mari to around 1760 B.C. Further references and discussion in Malamat (1989 1 n.2).

- 1 immerum a-na ^dIštar ša é-kál-lim
- 5 6 immerâtum a-na ^dDa-gan
- 6 immerâtum a-na ^dNin-hur-sag-gá
- 6 immerâtum a-na ^dŠamaš
- 2 immerâtum a-na ^dŠin
- 6 immerâtum a-na ^dI-túr-me-er
- 10 7 immerâtum a-na ^dDi-ri-tim
- 6 immerâtum a-na ^dAn-nu-ni-tim
- [2] immerâtum a-na ^dIGI-KUR
- 6 immerâtum a-na ^dAddu
- 2 immerâtum a-na ^dN[a-a]n-ni
- 15 2 immerâtum a-na ^dḥ[a-n]a-at
- 6 immerâtum a-na ^dNergal (=NĒ-UNU-GAL)
- 6 immerâtum a-na ^dÉ-a
- 2 immerâtum a-na ^dIštar
- 2 immerâtum a-na ^dBē[let] A-ga-di
- 20 2 immerâtum a-na ^dNu-mu-uš-da
- 2 immerâtum a-na ^dKi-ši-tim
- 2 immerâtum a-na ^dḤi-ša-mi-tim
- 2 immerâtum a-na ^dMârat al-tim
- 1 immerum a-na ^dNin-kar-ra-ak
- 25 1 immerum a-na ^dIš-ḥa-ra
- 1 immerum a-na ^dBēlet-ḥi-ša-ri
- napḥarum (=ŠU-NIGIN) 87 immerâtum^{ḥi-a}
- ša sí-ḥi-ir-ti
- bīt ilāni^{meš}
- 30 niqûm (=ZUR-ZUR-RI)
- i-na Ma-ri^{ki}
- Waraḥ Li-li-a-tim
- UD 27 KAM

In line 15 we find 2 sacrificial sheep destined for the goddess Ḥanat. According to Dossin (1950 47), Ḥanat appears in this list as one of four local deities along with *Ištar ša êkallim* (Ishtar of the palace), IGI-KUR, and Ḥiṣamîtum (the lady of Ḥiṣamta). In Dossin's view, the importance of this document lies in the summary of lines 27f. in which we read that 87 sheep of the round/totality (*sí-ḥi-ir-ti*) of the houses of the gods (*bīt ilāni*, construct singular used as a plural, cf. von Soden 1952 §64.1) in Mari are listed. He interpreted this as meaning (1950 42),

...nous avons la preuve formelle que les divinités qui bénéficiaient des offrandes royales sont énumérées au complet.⁷

However, subsequent publications have added other deities not found in Dossin's list but who nonetheless received state subsidised offerings and who therefore must be included within the pantheon of officially recognised deities. Lambert (1985 527) has compiled a list of sixteen such gods, and we can now only conclude with certainty that Dossin's list represents those deities who each received an offering on the particular date of this text, the 27th day of the month Liliatum, and *in this particular ceremony*. There is no question of Dossin (1950) being a comprehensive list of every deity officially recognised or funded at Mari.⁸

Dossin also attempted to interpret the number of sacrificial victims offered to each deity as an indication of their relative order of importance. This gives the following order:⁹

Seven Sheep	Six Sheep	Two Sheep	One Sheep
^d Di-ri-tim	^d Nin-é-gal	^d Šamaš ša ša-me-c	^d Ištar ša é-kál-lim
	^d Da-gan	^d Sin	^d Nin-kar-ra-ak
	^d Nin-ḫur-sag-gá	^d IGI-KUR	^d Iš-ḫa-ra
	^d Šamaš	^d N[a-a]n-ni ¹⁰	^d Bêlet-ḫi-ša-ri
	^d I-túr-me-cr	^d Ḫ[a-n]a-at	
	^d An-nu-ni-tim	^d Ištar	
	^d Addu	^d Bê[let] A-ga-di	
	^d Nergal (=NÈ-UNU-GAL)	^d Nu-mu-uš-da	
	^d É-a	^d Ki-ši-tim	
		^d Ḫi-ša-mi-tim	
		^d Mârat al-tim	

⁷A conclusion accepted also by Gelb (1954 270).

⁸See the discussion of sacrificial lists and deities in ARM 21 16f. and ARM 23 231f.

⁹In those cases where deities are offered the same number of sacrificial animals, they are listed in the order in which they occur in the text.

¹⁰Although the text is damaged at this point, we can be fairly certain of the numeral 2 since this is required to make the running total equal to the given total of 87 sacrificial animals in line 27.

However, it is clear that if this is a correct interpretation, the list itself does not follow this order; Dossin (1950 46) proposes that the actual order of the list may reflect a topographical reality, and appeals to the fact that in the list Ninḫursag immediately follows Dagan, whilst archaeological evidence seems to point to the close proximity of their temples at Mari.

In the light of newly published texts, unavailable to Dossin, his suggestion that we might rank the relative importance of the gods by comparing the number of offerings made to each appears to be mistaken. Looking only at the three offering lists which mention Anat (Dossin 1950; ARM 23.255; 23.279), it becomes clear that the number of offerings made to a particular deity can vary between lists: compare the seven sheep offered to Dîrîtum in Dossin (1950), the most offered to any of the gods in that list, to the single sheep offered to her in ARM 23.279 in which Anat is offered two sheep. However, recent work by Bardet *et al.* (1984 244f.) seems to show a close (although not perfect) correlation between the ten most mentioned deities in the administrative texts and those deities in Dossin (1950) who received seven or six sheep. We can only conclude that our knowledge of the state and palace theology at Mari is still uncertain, although a tentative conclusion is that Anat was not considered among the most important deities in the pantheon at Mari.

As for the actual order in which the gods appear in any of the lists, we cannot be certain what logic was at play. It may simply be a purely arbitrary order, although this is unlikely. On the other hand, it may reflect the status of the individual deities, irrespective of the number of victims offered to each, but since there appears to be no rigid order between texts, we would have to restrict such a relative ranking to each particular ceremony described by the list; we should note that although texts verify the importance of the deities Dagan and Itur-Mer at Mari (Lambert 1985), it is certainly not the case that they always come at the head of lists. As for Dossin's hypothesis that the order of the list results from the proximity of temples in the city of

Mari, there is also the possibility that it reflects a ceremonial procession through the city (Eaton 1964 11) which might be dictated by the geographical proximity of the respective temples.¹¹ However, there are many variables involved in any religious procession. Would such a procession start from the edge of the city and work its way inwards, or from the middle out to the edge calling in turn to temples in close geographical proximity? On the other hand, would it begin from the most important temple and work down to the least important, or perhaps work its way up from the least to the most important? Or would it follow some scheme dictated by a theological ideology which would be impossible for us to predict? Unfortunately we are in no position at present to establish what the historical reality was. Durand (1983 17) has recently suggested that the gods who appear in the administrative texts do not represent a 'pantheon' of Mari but rather those gods who were worshipped in 'chapelles palatiales' by the staff, family and harem of the king, although ARM 23 245 warns against making such a clear separation between the religious life of the palace and that of the temples and sanctuaries under the political hegemony of Mari. To be honest, the uncertainties of Mari theology far outweigh what we know from this list of offerings. What we can be certain of is that a deity ^dḪanat appears in the list, that she is offered two sacrificial sheep, that she appears to be a deity of West Semitic origin rather than one of the East Semitic deities which form a major part of this list,¹² and that it is unlikely that she played a major role in this particular ceremony.

¹¹Compare the description of the NIN.DINGIR festival procession at Emar (Fleming 1992).

¹²Dossin (1950 46) states that of the 25 divinities who appear in the list, 15 are known from the Sumero-Akkadian pantheon. These he lists as: Nin-êgal, Ninḫursag, šamaš, Sin, Annunî, Addu, Nanni, Nergal, Ea, Ištar, Bêlet Agadî (Lady of Akkad), Numušda, Kišîtum (Lady of Kiš), Nin-karrak, and Išḫara.

1.2.1.1.2. ARM 23.255

(1) 6 udu-nita₂-há (2) siskur₂-re (3) *a-na* ^d*i-túr-me-er* (4) 6 udu-nita₂ (5) dim₇-ma (6) 1 udu-nita₂ (7) *a-na* ^d*nin-é-[gal]* (8) 1 udu-nita₂ (9) *a-na* ^d*ší-ir-pí-im* (10) 2 udu-nita₂ (11) *a-na* ^d*ha-na-at* (12) šunigin 16 udu-há (13) dim₇-ma (14) *i-na ma-ri*^{ki} (Tr.lt.15) iti ^d*nin-bi-ri* (16) U₄ 7-kam

This much shorter offering list, like Dossin (1950) discussed above, specifies 2 sheep (UDU.NÍTA = *immeru*; Borger 1988 188) for the goddess *Ḫanat* (lines 10-11). The physical order in this list differs from that of Dossin (1950): the relative positions of Itur-Mêr and Nin-êgal are reversed so that in this list Nin-êgal is placed after Itur-Mêr although seven sacrificial animals are allotted Nin-êgal as opposed to the six of Dossin (1950); Širpim does not occur in Dossin (1950) at all; *Ḫanat* retains the same relative position beneath Itur-Mêr and Nin-êgal and is allotted the same number of sheep as in Dossin (1950). Again, this text tells us very little about the character of Anat.

1.2.1.1.3. ARM 23.279

(1) 2 udu-nita₂ (2) siskur₂-re (3) I ^{fd}*IM-du-ri* (4) *a-na* ^d*ha-na-at* (5) 1 udu-nita₂ (6) *a-na* ^d*di-ri-tim* (7) 1 udu dim₇-ma (8) 2 udu-nita₂ (9) *a-na* ^{giš}*banšur lugal* (10) šunigin 6 udu-há (11) dim₇-ma (12) *i-na ma-ri*^{ki} (13) iti ^d*nin-bi-ri* (14) U₄ 27-kam

This small text records the dispensation of six sheep; three were provided for an offering by Adad-dûrî, a senior court lady with wide ranging administrative responsibilities during the reign of Zimrilim (Batto 1974 64f.; Lambert 1985 527), to Anat (two sheep) and Diritim (one sheep), whilst three were for the king's table (^{giš}BANŠUR LUGAL = *paššûr šarrim*). As in Dossin (1950) and ARM 23.255.11, Anat is presented with two sacrificial sheep; on the other hand, the goddess Dîrîtum is

listed after Anat and only receives one offering whereas in Dossin (1950) she is listed before Anat and is the only deity to receive seven offerings.¹³

1.2.1.1.4. ARM 22.229

This damaged text lists a number of copper sickles owned by the palace, taken from the 'Bitumen' chamber by Mukannišum, and distributed to various deities. ^dHanat heads the list which continues with ^dŠamaš, [Iš]tar, ^dDagan ša Terqa^{ki}, ^dDagan ša Ú[r]ah^{ki}, and ^dDagan ša Mari^{ki}. On the other side of the tablet may be a second distribution list to deities including ^dDagan ša Mari^{ki}, ^dDagan ša Terqa^{k[i]}, and [Išta]r. Unfortunately, none of the figures has survived, which leaves us unable to make any comparisons between this text and the sacrificial lists discussed above. However, it should be noted that the list of gods in this text differs widely from those previously discussed, which provides further evidence against Dossin (1950) being an official 'pantheon' list.

1.2.1.1.5. ARM 21.110

- 1 1 qa Ì ŠU.ÚR.MÌN
 1 qa Ì.GA.HAR [Ì DUG.UTUL₂?]
a-na ^d*ha-na-at*
i-nu-ma LUGAL
- 5 *il-li-ku*
 ITI *k[i]-nu-nim* U₄ 25[?]-KAM
 MU *zi-im-ri-li-im*
 BÀD.*ia-ah-du-li-im*
i-pu-šu

Translated as,

- 1 qa d'huile de cyprès
 1 qa de beurre et de fromage, [huile de marmite?]

¹³For a discussion of these administrative documents and a comparative list of deities, locations, and offerings for the King's table, see ARM 23 231f.

pour Hanat;
lorsque le roi
vers Hanat
est allé;
Mois VII, le 25,
Z.6'¹⁴

In this short administrative text we see the distribution of various commodities to the goddess Ḫanat when the king travels to the city of Ḫanat. This text suggests that the goddess held her position among the gods at Mari because of her position as head of the local pantheon at ^dḪanat^{ki},¹⁵ approximately 75 miles downstream from, but incorporated into the political dominion of, Mari (Lewy 1934 48; Fronzaroli 1977 151).

This position is also reflected in ARM 8.85.4' in which we read that king Zimrilim was involved in a legal case during which an oath was taken. As part of the oath, food had to be eaten in the presence of Itur-Mer, Ḫanat and the king, presumably on the understanding that if any of the parties broke their oath, or were lying, the food would become poisonous to them. The text runs as follows,

They are claiming a field belonging to the palace saying "it is our own field!" The city Saggaratum assembled, and Zimri-Lim gave a judgement in Bit-Hanat, and [he assembled?] the city of Saggaratum for the oath of the god ceremony... in our presence they ate the asakkum - food of (the god) Itur-Mer, (the goddess) Hanat and (the king) Zimri-Lim.¹⁶

It is likely that the goddess IḪanat was included in this oath ceremony for no other reason than the fact that it was undertaken in her city (*Bit ^dḪa-na-at^{ki}*).

¹⁴Translation of Durand (1983).

¹⁵This place name is found with the divine determinative DINGIR: ARM 1.56.9; ARM 8.85.48 (where Zimri-Lim made a judgement on a legal case); ARM 13.43.10; ARM 14.124.4'; ARM 21.110.5; and without the divine determinative ARM 6.71.3, 2'; ARM 11.250.13; ARM 13.31.25; ARM 24.200.12.

¹⁶Translation of Dalley (1984 125).

Two further texts in which the divine name Ḫanat is found are ARM 13.16.15 and ARM 25.713.2, both of which are badly damaged. What we learn from the texts discussed above is that the goddess Ḫanat was worshipped as a deity by the Amorite population of Mari and its environs and, although not a major goddess within the palace at Mari, warranted recognition by the fact of her cultic centre at Bit Ḫanat.

1.2.1.2. Personal Names

In addition to her being included in sacrificial lists from the palace at Mari, this goddess' name is also frequently found as the divine element in theophoric names from the vicinity of Mari (Huffmon 1965 200f. and later publications of ARM).

1.2.1.2.1. *ab-du^dḫa-na-at*

Abdu-Anat - 'Servant of Anat'. This is a genitive compound name (Huffmon 1965 118f.) whose first element is the West Semitic root 'bd 'Slave, Servant' (the Akkadian equivalent is *wardum*). It is an orthographic variant of *ḫabdu-ḫanat* (see below). ARM 21.400.14; 23.385.2, 404.2. Without the semantic classifier DINGIR, ARM 21.138.53', 398.30; 23.516.7.

1.2.1.2.2. *ba-lu-ḫa-na-at*

Bālu-Anat - 'Anat is lord'? *Bālu* may be the orthographic representation of West Semitic *b'l, 'lord', which in many Amorite personal names is written *baḥlu*, where the *ḫ* represents the original ' (Huffmon 1965 174). Although the use of a masculine substantive with the feminine subject 'Anat' is surprising, it is not unprecedented (Gröndahl 1967 46). ARM 21.150.6, 11.

1.2.1.2.3. *ḫa-ab-du^dḫa-na-at*

Abdu-Anat - 'Servant of Anat'. This is an orthographic variant of *abdu-ḫanat* in which the initial ' is written with *ḫ*. In Dossin (1971) A.3562.viii.43 Abdu-

Anat is a rural slave in a list of personal names. A more prominent Abdu-Anat is one of the chief carpenters working during the reign of Zimrilim: ARM 7.181.13', 199.14'; 13.20.9, 12, 17, 40.12; 18.42.4; 21.11.11, 140.1, 295.8 (restored), 298.9, 397.2, 420.4; 22.12.1.5', 63.8; 23.186.2, 195.4, 196.2, 204.7, 213.22, 405.6 (restored), 410.2, 413.4, 517.7.

1.2.1.2.4. *^rha'-mi-^dha-na-at*

Hammi-Anat - 'Kinsman of Anat'. For a discussion of the element *hmm* see Huffmon (1965 196f.). This female is one of the head weavers. ARM 7.184.4'.

1.2.1.2.5. *ha-na-t[ī]-e-ba-al*

Anat-ebal - 'Anat brought'? The second element may be a 3s imperfect verb from **ybl* 'bring' as Huffmon (1965 76f.) has argued. ARM 24.233.i.19

1.2.1.2.6. *ha-na-ti-l-ba-al*

Anat-ibal - 'Anat brought'? An orthographic variant of Anat-ebal. Dossin (1971) A.3562.i.12 - rural slave.

1.2.1.2.7. *ha-na-tum*

Possibly a hypocoristicon. A hypocoristic personal name can be formed on the theophoric element and in simple formulations can take a case ending with mimation, *-um* usually for masculine names (Huffmon 1965 130f.). This name belongs to three different weavers mentioned in the list ARM 13.1.i.34, v.48, xii.4.

1.2.1.2.8. *^dha-na-at-um-mi*

Anat-ummi - 'Anat is my mother'. ARM 22.10.iii.10.

1.2.1.2.9. *ka-bi-^dḥa-na-at*

Kabi-Anat - 'Like my father is Anat'. This is again a surprising combination (cf. *ba-lu-ḥa-na-at* above) which brings to mind the exclamation of the Ugaritic goddesses to El as *ad ad* and *um um* (KTU 1.23.32-33). ARM 25.96.3

1.2.1.2.10. *mu-ut-^dḥa-na-at*

Mut-Anat - 'Man of Anat'. Compound genitive type of name whose first element is from the root **mt* meaning 'man' (Huffmon 1965 234). Dossin (1971) A.3652.x.65 is a rural slave. ARM 22.1.i.6. In ARM 22.4.10'; 23.612.5 it is without the semantic classifier DINGIR. In ARM 4.80.10' we find the orthographic variant ¹*Mutu-kanata*. The reference in the index of ARM 23 to text 83.3 is a mistake, since the text reads *mu-tu-ra-me-e*.

1.2.1.2.11. *ṣilli-^dḥa-na-at*

Ṣilli-Anat - 'Anat is my protection'. This is a nominal sentence name (Huffmon 1965 95f.) whose first element is from the Semitic root **zll* (Huffmon 1965 257). ARM 13.83.8.

1.2.1.2.12. *um-mi-^dḥa-na-at*

Ummi-Anat - 'My mother is Anat'. This nominal sentence name conforms to the more frequent pattern of predicate-subject (Huffmon 1965 95) unlike the variant ^d*ḥanat-ummi* above. Dossin (1971) A.3151.iv.71; ARM 22.57.B.III'.21'; 23.159.5. The last reference is preceded by the semantic classifier MÍ used before personal names to indicate that the bearer of the name was female.

1.2.1.2.13. *zi-ik-ri-^dha-na-at*

Zikri-Anat - 'My remembrance is Anat'. A nominal sentence name whose first element is from the Semitic root **ḏkr* and may be a subjective genitive with 1s pronominal suffix (Huffmon 1965 187). Dr. N. Wyatt (*oral communication*) has suggested 'My parent is Anat' based on the Arabic *ḏkr* 'penis' and BH זכר 'male', although this suggested etymology should perhaps be better translated 'my father' or 'my man' rather than the gender neutral 'parent'. Although the masculine gender of the suggested predicate presents no insurmountable difficulty in light of the above examples, it is difficult to understand why this obscure term would have been used instead of the more familiar *abu* 'father' or *mutu* 'man' (cf. *mu-ti-a-n(a-t)a* above). ARM 8.80.9; 7.130.5 (without semantic classifier DINGIR).

These are all the references to the goddess Anat known so far from the Mari archives. As we have seen, she is not an uncommon figure among the Amorite population of Mari; in contrast, there are very few references to this goddess in other Old Babylonian texts, but we do find the following theophoric names.

1.2.1.3. Old Babylonian Personal Names

1.2.1.3.1. *bu-nu-a-na-ti*

Dhorme (1928 78) reads this as 'Son of Anat'. This takes the first element as the Akkadian noun *būnu*, 'Son' (*CAD* 2.322), which is a far less common noun than its synonym *māru* 'Son'.¹⁷ The more usual orthography found from Old Akkadian onwards is *bīnu*. Huffmon (1965 176) gives several examples of Amorite personal names from Mari which begin with the element *bunu-* from the root **bny*,

¹⁷*CAD* (vol. 2) gives only one reference for *būnu*, which comes from a Neo-Babylonian synonym list which reads, *bu-ū-nu = ma-a-ru*.

‘build, form’. Perhaps this Old Babylonian personal name is in fact an Amorite name meaning ‘creature of Anat’?

1.2.1.3.2. *bur-a-na-te*

Tallqvist (1918 66) reads this as ‘Offspring of ענת’. *būr* may be the construct of *būru* ‘calf, kid’ and by extension ‘offspring’ as used in many East Semitic theophoric personal names (CAD 2.340f.). Eaton (1964 15) reads this as ‘fountain/well of Anat’ taking *būr* as the construct of *būru* ‘well’.

1.2.1.3.3. *mu-ti-a-n(a-t)a*

‘Man of Anat’. *Mutu* is found from the old Akkadian period onwards and is used in Old Babylonian texts with the meaning of ‘husband’ and ‘man, warrior’ although it is much less common than the East Semitic *awīlum*. It is, however, used as an element in Amorite onomastics (Huffmon 1965 234) which raises the possibility that this was a West Semitic personal name.

1.2.1.3.4. *zi-im-ri-ḥa-na-ta*

‘Anat is my protection’. The element *zimri* ‘protection’ is a West Semitic lexeme found in many Amorite personal names at Mari (Albright 1925 86; Huffmon 1965 187f.). This fact, coupled with the typically Amorite orthography of *ḥ* for the guttural ‘ suggests that this name is in fact an Amorite personal name.

1.2.1.4. Conclusions

The picture we are able to construct of the character of the goddess from these personal names is scant indeed. We can see that humans are the servants or subjects of the goddess calling themselves (*ḥ*)*abdu* or *mutu*, whilst she is their *bālu*(!). On a different level several kinship terms are used to describe the relationship between human and goddess, such as *abu*, *ḥammu* and *ummu*, with a possible instance of *būnu*

if we take this as 'son' (see above). Perhaps as a development of the kinship theme between humans and the goddess, she is seen as a protector of her people; their *šillu* or *zimru*. A comparison with the personal names involving different deities quickly shows us that the human-divine relationship between Anat and her devotees is nothing out of the ordinary; this is the typical expression of such a relationship.

Turning to the question of the cultural roots of Anat, it appears from the above discussion that, in the historical period at least, the goddess was a West Semitic deity who gained popularity some time between the mid-third and early-second millennium B.C. among the Amorite population of Mari, and who had a cultic centre at ^dHanat^{ki} on the Euphrates. Given the evidence of the low frequency of East Semitic personal names with Anat and her absence from East Semitic god-lists, etc., it seems likely that she arrived there among the theological baggage of Amorite immigrants who appear to have been fairly common throughout this period. At Mari she was venerated by palace officials as well as by the civilian population, witnessed in the many personal names in which her name appears as the divine element. Even the king of Mari has dealings with her when he has contact with the city ^dHanat^{ki}. Personal names from elsewhere in the Old Babylonian period in which the goddess is the divine element appear likely to be West Semitic. If we wish to seek the etymological root of her name, it would seem more appropriate to look for a West Semitic root rather than an East Semitic one. In other words, it is likely that the etymology is to be found either in a common East-West Semitic lexeme, or one that is specifically West Semitic, but not one that is specifically East Semitic.

1.2.2. Anat in Ugaritic Personal Names

Almost half a millennium separates the Mari archives from the texts found at Ugarit, where Anat plays a considerable role in the extant mythic narratives and is found in a great many of the god-lists and sacrificial lists. All these texts will be

discussed in due course; at this point I would like to turn attention to the personal names found in Ugaritic texts in which 'nt happens to be the divine element. The apparent dearth of such names (Gröndahl 1967 83) seems at first to be contrary to the prominent position of the goddess in literary texts, and may prompt one to draw some distinction between a supposed 'state' religion in which she was a major player, and the personal religious affiliations of the populace. However, I would hesitate to attach any great significance to this fact until we have a greater understanding of the processes behind the bestowing of personal names and the general survival of onomastics. For now it will be sufficient to list the occurrences of personal names with Anat as the divine element.¹⁸

1.2.2.1. Syllabic Cuneiform Texts

We find the syllabic spelling of the divine name in the 'pantheon list' RS 20.24.20 (Nougayrol 1968) as ^d*a-na-tum*.¹⁹ In the syllabic texts from Ugarit we find the following theophoric personal names with Anat as the divine element.

1.2.2.1.1. ¹*abdi-a-na-ti*

Abdi-Anat - "Servant of Anat". RS 15.139.7 (PRU 3 166), son of Gimillum, dated to the reign of Ibiranu, son of Ammištamru. RS 16.129.19 (PRU 3 32), the scribe of this tablet which is without date. RS 16.170.2'-3' (PRU 3 91), broken in both the occurrences; the tablet is dated to the reign of Niqmepa, son of Niqmadu. RS 17.335.5, 9, 25, 11' (PRU 4 17.335) mentions Abdi-Anat king of

¹⁸A collection of Ugaritic onomastics is presented in Gröndahl (1967).

¹⁹We also find the syllabic spelling of her name in Hurrian texts at Ugarit (Laroche 1968), including her possible inclusion in the first line of a Hurrian cult song (RS 15.30 + 15.49 + 17.387; Laroche 1968 h.6; Kilmer 1974).

Siyannu and Niqmepa king of Ugarit in a document dealing with border division (Cf. RS 17.368.5 and 17.382.6, 10).

1.2.2.1.2. ¹*abdi-an-tu/ti*

Strictly speaking, this could be read as Abdi-Antum - "Servant of Antum", which could theoretically be taken as the feminine counterpart of the Mesopotamian sky god Anu. Neither Anu nor Antum play any part in Ugaritic myth of which we are aware; however, we find the divine name 'n used as the theophoric element in personal names (Gröndahl 1967 83, 110; Zadok 1986 394 n.123). This male deity plays no role in Ugarit myth beyond perhaps being a scholarly invention, the masculine counterpart to 'nt on the model of the pair 'ttr/'ttrt, and perhaps prompted by gender paired epithets such as *il-ilt* and *b'l-b'lt*. The presence at Ugarit of scribes versed in Akkadian makes it likely that there was at least an awareness at Ugarit of the Mesopotamian divine pair Anu - Antum, and we cannot rule out the possibility that they were influenced in part by it, although this cannot be proved. Virolleaud (1940-1941a 41 n.1) states that there can be no doubt that we should read the spelling *Abdi-an-tum* as Abdi-Anat. In his discussion of RS 14.16 (1951 177 n.1), he explains that the variant forms *a-na-ti* and *-an-ta/tu* are most likely due to the confusion by the Mesopotamian scribe who wrote this tablet, of Ugaritic Anat with Mesopotamian Antum. However, it must be pointed out that there are many examples of personal names in which the medial vowel of the divine name 'Anat' is not elided. In the very same tablet (RS 14.16.7) we find the spelling *A-na-ti*- which certainly puts a question mark over the apparent 'confusion' of the scribe. Many of the examples given in this discussion show the divine name in syllabic cuneiform with a medial vowel, which is also found in the syllabic spelling of her name in RS 20.24.20, ^d*A-na-tum*, which prompts Nougayrol (1968 55) to the conclusion that the two goddesses, Anat and Antum, were not usually confused by the west Semites. On the other hand, if we accept Nougayrol's (1955 xxxviii) identification of the scribe of RS 16.129 and

RS 16.178 as one and the same, Abdi-an(a)ti, then we have here an example of two variant spellings of *Anati* as the personal name of the same person, one of which does not show the medial vowel.

RS 8.145 (Thureau-Dangin 1937), the son of *Bur-zu-mi-*. RS 14.16.5 (-*an-ta*), 6 and 9 (-*an-tù*). RS 16.178.21 (PRU 3 148), the scribe of this tablet which is dated to the reign of Ammištamru, son of Niqmepa. RS 16.192A+16.205.5 (PRU 3 153), broken: the text reads ¹*abd[i-an-ti]*, son of Abdiba'al, dated to the reign of Amištamu, son of Niqmepa. RS 16.239.5 (PRU 3 79), the son of Šuwandanu,²⁰ dated to the reign of Arḫalbu, son of Niqmadu. RS 16.126B + 16.257 + 16.258 + 16.345.iii.39 (PRU 3 199), the son of Kabizzi whose occupation is given as priest (^{amilM}*šangû*), undated.

1.2.2.1.3. ^f*a-na-ti-um-me*

Anati-umme - 'Anat is mother'. RS 14.16.7 (Virolleaud 1951).

1.2.2.1.4. ^š*u-um-a-na-ti*

'Name of Anat'. RS 15.139.9 (PRU 3 166) Son of *ḫagabana*.

1.2.2.1.5. ⁿAN-IGI^{at}

In RS 11.839.12, 16 (PRU 3 194) we find the personal name ⁿAN-IGI^{at} which is probably to be read as the divine name 'Anat' (Virolleaud 1941 9 n.1). AN is the semantic classifier DINGIR which gives us the clue that this is the theophoric element of a hypocoristic personal name. The ideograph IGI may be read as Akkadian

²⁰Wyatt (*oral comm.*) has indicated that Šuwandanu is a Sanskrit name.

īnu ‘eye, spring’ or as the vocable *īnu*, *ēnu* (Borger 1988 172).²¹ In line 11-12 we read,

69 *kaspu*^M *ina qâti* ^I*ši-id-qa-na mâr* ^{lil}*ēna-at*

This translates as, ‘69 (measures) of silver in the hand of Šidqana son of Anat’. The semantic classifier DINGIR before IGI-*at* tells us that it is to be read as a divine name, but we should not translate the personal name to mean ‘Šidqana son of (the goddess) Anat’, since the ideograph DIŠ is the semantic classifier that indicates a personal name is intended. If we accept the reasoning of Layton (1990 217f.) who discusses the similar name ‘Shamgar ben Anat’ in Jud. 3.31, 5.6, we should understand the name as ‘Šidqana son of (son of) Anat’. He suggests that personal names which appear to be identical to divine names are likely to be an abbreviated form in which an initial *bēn* has dropped out (*contra* Albright 1925 84). In the example of lines 11-12, we may have an original patronym *bīn-Anat*, which in the personal name *šidqana bīn* <*bīn*> ^d*Anat* becomes abbreviated to *šidqana bīn* ^d*Anat* as we find in this text.

In RS 11.839.16 (PRU 3 194) we find,

1 *me’at* 60 *kaspu*^M *ina qâti* ^I*bin-lil* *ēna-at*

which we can translate, ‘One hundred and sixty (measures) of silver in the hand of Son of Anat’. This is perhaps an example of a personal name which when used as a patronym presents us with forms such as *ši-id-qa-na mâr* ^{lil}*ēna-at* discussed above.

²¹Virolleaud (1941 9 n.1) gives two examples of geographic names in which this ideograph is used for Ugaritic ‘n. RS 11.800.9, ^{alu}IGI-*ma-ka* = Ug. ‘*nmk(y)*, and RS 11.790.2, ^{alu}IGI-*qâp-at* = Ug. ‘*nqpat*, both of which are names of springs (Virolleaud 1940 146). Gordon (1985 494) uses this example to argue for the reduction of the diphthong *ay* > *a* in Ugaritic.

1.2.2.2. Alphabetic Cuneiform Texts

From the alphabetic texts we find the following personal names:

1.2.2.2.1. *il'nt*

Since the personal name 'God of Anat' (on the lines of *bn'nt* or *'bd'nt*) is highly improbable, it is better to take it as 'My god is Anat'. *KTU* 4.617.43 is part of a list of personal names. The grammatical disparity between the gender of the predicate *il* and the subject *'nt* is a phenomenon found as early as the Old Babylonian texts discussed above. Although in this isolated instance we might believe it to be simply a lapse of spelling (*il* for *ilt*), the fact that Gröndahl (1967 46) is able to list several other examples of this phenomenon implies that it was a recognisable practice among the Semitic speaking peoples. De Moor (1969 171 n.21) uses this name as partial evidence for the bisexual nature of the goddess, but Loewenstamm (1982), pointing to Gröndahl (1967), counters with the fact that discrepancies between subject and predicate are not unknown for subjects other than Anat.

1.2.2.2.2. *bn'nt*

'Son of Anat'.²² *KTU* 4.37.1 (*b*n'ntn*) adds a suffixed -n to the divine element in this personal name; 4.307.6 (*bn.'nt*) is a list of personal names; 4.320.4 is a list of *'bdm* (Dietrich *et al.* 1974 22). Compare the syllabic form of this name in a

²²Craigie (1972), in his discussion of the personal name Shamgar ben Anat, has put forward the idea that 'son of Anat' could indicate the name of a military title or epithet based on the warlike character of Anat. However, there is no evidence in the personal names we have found to suggest that the theophoric name *bn'nt* should be thought of differently from any other theophoric name of the kind '*bn-DN*', in that it simply indicates the person was a devotee of the named divinity without having to assume that the devotee took on some aspect of the deity he or she was named after. Craigie's idea also fails to take into account the name of Ramesses II's daughter *bnt'nt*, unless we either accept that she was an exceptional warrior (for which we have no evidence) or that the pharaoh did not fully understand the implications of the name *bn'nt* when he applied the feminine form to his daughter.

legal text from Hazor ^mDUMU-*ḥa-nu-ta* (Hallo and Tadmor 1977),²³ the Egyptian occurrences of this name in both masculine and feminine forms using the West Semitic form *bn* (see below), and a possible occurrence of this name on an arrow head published by Milik (1956) and read by Yeivin (1958) as *ḥṣ zkrb('l) / bn bn-'n(t)*.

1.2.2.2.3. *'bd'nt*

'Servant of Anat'. *KTU* 4.151.9 reads [*'bd'nt*. It is interesting to note that in line 11 we find [*'bdilt*. However, although we know that Anat quite naturally received the epithet *ilt* (*KTU* 1.3.ii.18), it is impossible to know whether a personal name such as *'bdilt* should refer to Anat, or to any other of the goddesses known to have been recognised at Ugarit.

1.2.2.2.4. *ḡlm'nt* or *šm'nt*

'Servant of Anat' or 'Name of Anat'. The variant reading springs from the lacuna that breaks off the text immediately before the *m*. Virolleaud (1940-1941) reads ...*ḡl**m'nt*, *UT* 323 prefers to leave the lacuna blank, ...*]m'nt*, whilst *KTU* 4.75.iv.4 reads *bn.]š*m'nt*. Examination of the photograph in *CTA* (Pl. LXI 102, B, Rev.) is of little help due to the poor quality of reproduction. *CTA* (193 n.4) does claim to see the remains of an oblique wedge just before the *m* which may be an *'*, but is more likely to be the end of *š*. With this evidence, *CTA* reads *šm'nt*. It must be said that although the evidence is slim, comparative onomastics would favour the reading *šm'nt* since there are no personal names in which the human is labelled with *ḡlm*, but many of the form *šm*-DN (Gröndahl 1967 141, 193f.). In fact, *šm'nt* corresponds to the Akkadian personal name *šu-um-a-na-ti* of *RS* 15.139.9 discussed above.

²³Hallo and Tadmor take this as the equivalent to the Hebrew עֲבֹדָה in which we witness the vocalic shift from *ā* to *ō* (1977 5). This text also contains the name ^m*su-mu-ḥa-nu-ta*, in which the first element may represent the element *šm* 'name', although we should expect *šu-mu*.

1.2.2.3. Conclusions

There is very little to be gleaned from personal names which sheds new light on what we already know of the character of the goddess Anat from the literary sources. In the syllabic texts we find her name spelled variously *a na ti*, *an tui* and in one text it is spelled ideographically as IGI-*at*. The syllabic elements with her name are *abdu*, *šumu* and *ummu*. In the alphabetic sources her name is linked with the elements *il*, *bn*, *'bd* and possibly *šm*, two of which are mirrored in the syllabic names, *'bd* - *abdu*, *šm* - *šumu*, whilst a third shares the same semantic relationship *bn* - *ummu*; the bearer of the name is the son of Anat, Anat is the mother of the man. There is nothing in this which departs radically from the earlier names we found in the Mari archives where we also found the elements *abdu*, *ummu* and one possible occurrence of *būnu* as 'son' (although see above). The name *il'nt* is surprising in its use of a masculine substantive with a feminine deity but we also find this phenomenon with the name *ilšpš*, and the large number of examples of this type of name (Gröndahl 1967 94f.) might suggest the form *'l-DN* has lapsed into a stereotypical formula, irrespective of the gender of the deity.

1.3. THE ETYMOLOGY OF 'NT

1.3.1. 'Providence, Will'

Having examined the early history of the divine name from the period of the Mari archives, and its use in Ugaritic personal names, we now turn our attention to the numerous suggestions that have been advanced by scholars for the etymology of the divine name *'nt*. Albright's (1925) contribution to the debate was made shortly before the discovery of the Ugaritic texts but has remained influential for a long

period.²⁴ His etymology of the divine name is derived partly from a consideration of the Hebrew lexicon, and partly from the context of the Elephantine texts. Discussing the divine names *ענתביתאל* and *ענתיהו* found in the papyri (see below), he begins his argument by dismissing the idea of an androgynous deity 'Anatbethel' or 'Anatyahu' and continues with the statement that it is "not reasonable" (94) to interpret these names as 'Anat of Yahu' or the like. Rather, he believes the element *ענת* to be a substantive in construct with what follows, and therefore searches for some common noun in the Hebrew lexicon, "from which both the name of the goddess and the first element in our two names may be derived" (94). He suggests 'Purpose' or 'Providence' as a semantic development from an original root **ny* 'to stretch, bend',²⁵ based on his reading of Ps. 45.5 and Ps. 18.36 (=II Sam. 22.36). In Ps. 45.5 the phrase in question reads,

עַל־דְּבַר־אֱמֶת וְעֲנִיָּה צֶדֶק

The translation is not without difficulty. Albright finds the LXX's attempt 'for the sake of truth, meekness and righteousness' unconvincing since his prosodic analysis of the text suggests two parallel phrases rather than a string of three substantives, i.e., *עַנְיָה צֶדֶק* || *דְּבַר אֱמֶת*. Albright accepts the alternative reading *עֲנֹת* of some manuscripts which provides him with a feminine plural substantive in parallel with an original (') *דְּבַר*. He writes,

²⁴E.g. van Zijl (1972 65), Bowman (1978 260).

²⁵Albright (1935 191 n.59) also sees this meaning in a personal name from the Hyksos period; he translates the name *nthr* as "har is my protection", despite the fact that this name dates over a thousand years before the evidence from Elephantine, at a period when the widespread worship of the goddess Anat cannot be denied.

In older Hebrew literature, not under Aramaic influence, the stem [*ny*] is almost extinct, but has left traces showing its earlier importance. Thus we have the *hapax legomenon* *ma'neh*, "purpose," in Prov. 16:4, where it is used of the predestination of God, but also such fossils as *ya'an* and *lema'an*... We are, therefore, quite justified in assuming that the word *'anôt* is the plural of an *'anát*... meaning "purpose, providence," or the like. (95)

Despite Albright's confidence that this meaning "fits perfectly" in Ps. 45.5, his semantic bridge building between an original 'stretch, bend' to the developed 'providence' is somewhat fragile, and from the viewpoint of poetic parallelism, it is a matter of contention that his translation 'words of truth' || 'purposes of right' is any real advance. There is agreement that the phrase *rēkab 'al dēbar 'ēmet* seems to mean something like 'ride for the cause/on behalf of truth' (Dahood 1965; Craigie 1983; Kraus 1988). 'Because of/for the sake of' is an acceptable translation for *עַל דְּבַר*,²⁶ although in Ps. 119.43 we find the construct-genitive phrase *דְּבַר-אֱמֶת* best translated by 'word of truth' which raises the possibility that it could be understood as such in Ps. 45. The verb *רָכַב* very often is followed by a prepositional phrase introduced with *עַל*. Hypothetically, we could understand the phrase in the following manner: imperative 'Ride!' followed by the preposition *עַל* 'upon', followed by the construct genitive phrase 'truthful word'.

Continuing along this line of enquiry, if we look for a semantic parallel to *עֲנֶה* in *דְּבַר*, then perhaps we need look no further than the common meaning of *עֲנֶה* I 'to answer, respond' (BDB 772), already found as a parallel to *דְּבַר* in I Kgs. 1.10, 11, and 12. If we accept the reading of some manuscripts and see in *עֲנוּת* a nominalised form of the verb, then in *עֲנוּת צֶדֶק* we have a phrase which is grammatically parallel to the previous *דְּבַר אֱמֶת*, and which could be translated 'righteous answers/oracles'. We then have the following translation of the whole phrase, 'Ride out on truthful word(s) and righteous oracle(s)'. This might not make any literal sense, but could be

²⁶Used in this sense in e.g. Gen. 20.11, 18; Ex. 8.8; Ps. 79.9; Dt. 4.21.

understood as a metaphor for the king's traditional role of defender of the weakest members of society, acting on the instigation of God whose words by definition cannot be anything other than true and righteous.

If, on the other hand, we understand the phrase as a string of three substantives preceded by the phrase *על דבר*, we need only move the *waw* from before the second and put it in front of the last in order to make sense of it (Kraus 1988 455). In this case we have the picture of the king riding out to defend what is described by the three substantives *אמת*, *צדק* and *ענוה*. The first two can be translated 'truth' and 'righteousness', whilst the latter is to be coupled with 'fear of Yhwh' (*יראת יהוה*: Pr. 15.33, 22.4) which leads to honour (*כבוד*: Pr. 15.33, 18.12, 22.4), riches and life (*עשר* and *חיים*: Pr. 22.4). Its opposite is expressed by *גבה*, 'be high, exalted' (Pr. 18.12), which can have both positive and negative connotations, whilst in Zeph. 2.3 *ענוה* appears as something that should be sought along with *יהוה* and *צדק*. Seen in this positive light, its mention alongside *אמת* and *צדק*, which at first glance appears odd, can be easily understood as something the king should strive to maintain by means of force. Albright's (1925 95) conclusion that the LXX version is "nonsense" and that *ענוה* "cannot mean 'meekness', or the like", is seen to be too hasty.

The other passage to which Albright appeals in support of his case is Ps. 18.36 which has a parallel in II Sam. 22.36. In Ps. 18.36 we read *וְעֲנִיתִיךָ תִרְבֶּנִּי* and in II Sam. 22.36 *וְעֲנִיתִיךָ תִרְבֶּנִּי*. In the first example, the vocalised text gives 'your meekness', whereas the LXX's translation *ἡ παιδεία σου* 'your instruction' is perhaps based on the root *ענה* 'answer'. The text of II Sam 22.36 gives us a verbal noun with 2ms pronominal suffix 'your answer', or 'your oracle' (Kraus 1988 255) which can easily be understood in the context of seeking an oracle before going to war. Whether the Qumran reading *עזרתך* 'your help' stands closer to the original intention of the text or whether it simply emends a text which even in this early stage

has become enigmatic is difficult to establish, although one could easily understand how a difficult ענותך became emended to עזרתך but not the reverse. There is no real consonantal difference between the Masoretic text of the Psalms and II Sam. passage, the former having the vowel spelling י. It is thus not impossible that the vocalisation of the II Sam. passage stands closer to an original intention and is reflected in the consonantal text of the Psalms passage which has subsequently been reinterpreted. The idea that an answer or oracle of Yhwh should make the king great may be corroborated by II Sam. 22.42 (\approx Ps. 18.42) in which the defeated enemies of the king are depicted as crying out to Yhwh but receiving no answer.

What the above discussion indicates is that Albright's arguments for understanding 'ny as 'purpose, providence' are far from assured, and it would certainly be unsuitable to use his hypothesis as the foundation for another. However, this is exactly what Albright does when he applies his hypothetical translation of 'ny to the Elephantine texts where he proposes ענת'יהו to mean 'providence of Yahu', and ענתביתא'ל to mean 'providence of God', where ביתא'ל (temple, house of God) has become a synonym for 'God' through the process of deification of the shrine (96). In fact he extends his hypothesis to the idea that some unknown Jewish theological school demythologised the deity Anat to arrive at the theological-philosophical conception of 'Providence' as a form of Yahweh (101), but that this was only possible since the name of the goddess itself had this same meaning at its root (97). Hence he concludes that the divine name 'nt itself meant 'providence, predestination'. When the new evidence from Ugaritic texts became available, Albright (1933 193) proposed that the "original meaning" of the name Anat, which in his book should take the form *'nt b'l, is 'purpose, providence of Baal'. He now connects the etymology of the divine name with Akkadian *ettu*, *ittu* 'mark, sign, omen' (CAD 7.304), which is derived from an original **entu*, and which gives the Hebrew עת 'sign, fate, destiny'.

Turning to the problem of Anat at Elephantine, we must ask ourselves why Albright dismisses as “not reasonable” the interpretation of עַנַת־יְהוָה as ‘Anat of Yahu’? Although he does not elaborate, it is probable that part of the problem was his objection on grammatical grounds to a proper noun in the construct state; however, Barré (1983 50 n.97) has amply demonstrated from more recent evidence that this can no longer be grounds for objection. I suspect that part of his objection was his repulsion of the idea of a fifth century Jewish colony openly and freely worshipping deities other than Yahweh.²⁷ So did the Jews at Elephantine use the lexeme *‘nt* as a common noun, or did they rather understand it as a divine name, a reference to the goddess Anat? It is to this problem we now turn.

1.3.1.1. Excursus: Anat at Elephantine²⁸

Our first impression of the Jewish section of the military outpost at Elephantine, on the southernmost edge of Egypt, is that it practised a syncretistic form of worship.²⁹ This, and the fact that it possessed a temple dedicated to Yhw despite the alleged dominance of Deuteronomic theology in Israel from the end of the seventh century, which promoted the single sanctuary at Jerusalem, has proved an

²⁷For a recent examination of the life and work of Albright, see the collection of essays in *Biblical Archaeologist* 56 (1993), and for a critical appraisal of the essentially conservative method adopted by Albright, see in particular Dever (1993).

²⁸For the sake of consistency, I follow the numbering system of Fitzmyer *et al.* (1992) unless otherwise stated. This is not the place for a full and detailed examination of the theology of the Jewish colony at Elephantine; for an introduction to the site’s discovery, subsequent excavation and further discussion see *inter alia* Kraeling (1953), Porten (1968), and in a more condensed form, Porten (1992). Further references are found in Fitzmyer *et al.* (1992).

²⁹For example, we find the use of the plural אֱלֹהִים ‘the gods’ as the subject of plural verbs in letters from one Jew to another (Cowley 1923 xix). TADB2.6.1 reads, אֱלֹהִים כָּל יִשְׁאָל, ‘may all the gods seck...’. Porten (1968 160) protests that perhaps these conventional greetings were penned by non-Jewish scribes who simply began the letter in a standard format, or that a Jewish scribe used a plural form with similar semantic intention as we find אֱלֹהִים in Biblical Hebrew as a designation of a single deity, but I believe that the use of a plural form of the verb in such a natural context counts against his objection.

enduring fascination for scholars engaged in the study of the site and its literary remains. Cowley (1923 xviii), publishing the extant Aramaic papyri of his day, has no doubt that the Jews at Elephantine, although holding their god 𐤀𐤋 in highest regard, also freely venerated other deities such as Anat, Bethel, Ishum and 𐤇𐤍𐤏𐤍. In the opposite camp Albright (1925 96) writes,

We therefore find our supposedly heathen companions of God turning out to be nothing more serious than attributes of deity. *Ešem-bêt'el* is the hypostatized "name of God"; *Herem-bêt'el* is probably the "sacredness of God"; '*Anat-bêt'el* = '*Anat-Yáhû* is the "providence [or predestination] of God."

Taking the middle ground between these two positions stands Kraeling (1953 83f) who takes the view that the Jews at Elephantine were primarily 𐤀𐤋 worshippers but,

...as a matter of insurance they were willing to give a bit of attention to several subsidiary gods, whom they might readily view as his vassals or helpers. ...Mutual tolerance and a willingness to recognize other deities were almost a practical necessity.

In other words, Kraeling's view is that the Jews practised a limited form of polytheistic worship as an insurance policy against stirring up the wrath of public opinion against themselves, although if this was their motive, it seems to have been singularly ineffectual since their temple was destroyed at the end of the fifth century by religious rivals (Dalglish 1992 708). Porten (1968) rather reluctantly admits that there was syncretism amongst the Jews at Elephantine but appears to excuse the male Jews of their 'folly' by his assumption that the Jewish colony would have theoretically been an exclusivist cult of Yhw but for the failings of the women! Discussing the worship of the Queen of Heaven by Jews in Egypt, he feels that women played a predominant role (1968 176), and repeats the claim for the worship of Asherah and Anat in Israel. He concludes (178),

The impression gained is that cults to these goddesses stemmed from pagan influences resulting from intermarriage. From earliest times it was feared in Israel that marrying a Canaanite woman would result in worshipping her gods... The circumstances under which worship of the Queen of Heaven (Anath) was introduced into Judah are uncertain but it is noteworthy that women predominated among her devotees.

Whether the fault of women or a policy of pacifying one's neighbours, both these views stem from the supposition that the cult of Yahweh in post-exilic Israel was primarily an exclusivist cult, a position culled from the religious documents of the Hebrew scriptures. We must recognise, however, that as archaeological artefacts, the Aramaic papyri from Elephantine are a direct witness to a Yhw cult of the fifth century B.C. (albeit outside the political boundary of Israel itself), whereas the Hebrew scriptures cannot aspire to such a claim. Unlike the Hebrew texts which have been subjected to generations of editorial manipulation for motives both political and ideological, the Aramaic papyri are a 'snapshot' of a Yhw cult from the fifth century and as such should be afforded at least equal weight with the Hebrew scriptures in any analysis of this period in the history of Israelite religion. We must bear this in mind (along with the peculiar circumstances of the colony) when we examine the evidence for syncretistic worship by the Jews at Elephantine, and in particular in the question of whether Anat was worshipped as a deity by them, and not begin with the assumption that the ideal to which the Jewish Elephantine colony strove was an exclusivist cult of יהוה.

Evidence for the worship of Anat at Elephantine comes from three occurrences of the lexeme 'nt:

1. TADB7.3 is an oath taken in a court of law, concerning the right of possession of an ass; in line 3 Menahem swears an oath by or in the temple (במסכדא)³⁰ and by Anatyahu (ובענתיהו).

2. In the large list of contributors to the collection for the god Yhw (TADC3.15) we find in lines 122f.³¹ the collected sum of money divided between three deities: יהו, אשמביתאל, and ענתביתאל.

3. In the same text we find the personal name ענתי³² (Grelot 89.107).

For Albright (1925 96), ביתאל simply means 'house of God, sanctuary, temple' and is to be equated with the term 'God'. He illustrates this by reference to the post-biblical equation *ham-maqôm = haš-šem = elôhîm*, and states that the Jewish deification of the shrine within a strictly monotheistic context, itself an adaptation of the polytheistic example of the Canaanites, was initiated in the attempt to avoid using the divine name. However, there seems little doubt that Bethel was worshipped as a divinity, at least by those outside the Jewish community at Elephantine.³³ In one of the Hermopolis letters we read of a temple of Bethel (בית בתאל) and a temple of the

³⁰For a discussion of the term מסכדא see Porten (1968 155) who suggests 'altar precinct' since the Aramaic and Arabic root means 'bow down' and the altar was the place where Solomon is said to have prayed and where oaths were taken (I Kg 8:31, 54).

³¹Grelot's numbering. Lines 123f in Cowley 22.

³²The personal name ענתי also occurs in line 3 of one of the Hermopolis letters dispatched to Syene, TADA2.1, and is an echo of an earlier personal name *a-na-ti* found in one of the El-Amarna texts (EA 170.43). Also for the form of the name ענתי בן see my comments on the name "AN-IGI^{at}, above.

³³Vincent (1937 565) concludes, "Il est donc incontestable, les complexes divins et les noms théophores le prouvent, que Béthel existait en tant que dieu personnel et distinct au temps des Papyrus araméens d'Éléphantine." See also Milik (1967 565f.), Dalglish (1992).

Queen of Heaven (מלכת שמיים),³⁴ whilst the numerous theophorous personal names in which Bethel is the divine element also point us in the same direction.³⁵ Perhaps the oldest reference to the divinity Bethel occurs in the treaty between Esarhaddon of Assyria and the King of Tyre c. 676 B.C. (Barré 1983, Clifford 1990 60) where we find *ḏBa-a-a-ti-il*^{meš},³⁶ followed by a reference to Anat-Bethel, *ḏA-na(?) -ti-Ba-lal-[a-ti-il]*^{meš},³⁷ in which case we have a Phoenician precedent to the pantheon structure found at Syene, and possibly worshipped at Elephantine.³⁸ Barré (1983 45f., App. II) convincingly argues for Bethel and Anat-Bethel as the leading gods of the Tyrian pantheon during the seventh century, at least as far as the Assyrians were concerned, although there is some confusion over the status of Melqart (Clifford 1990 56). He maintains that the divinity Bethel was originally a hypostasis of El, and the absence of the latter at Elephantine is the result of the increased popularity of the former (49). Barré also argues for an understanding of Anat-Bethel as “Anat the consort of Bethel” (50).³⁹ Whilst a connubial relationship between Anat and El (albeit disguised in a

³⁴TADA2.1. See also Beyerlin (ed.) (1978 255f.). For a discussion of the Queen of Heaven cf. Milik (1967 557f).

³⁵See the very useful collection of personal names in Porten (1968 Appendix V), where he lists thirty two personal names compounded with the DN Bethel.

³⁶Vincent (1937 567) points out that the form is a plural. The prefixed determinative shows us that this was a divinity as opposed to an actual temple *aširtu* which could also be written as a plural even though the singular was meant (É.DINGIR.MEŠ), see CAD (1/II.436f.).

³⁷Borger (1956 109). Borger (1957 103) believes that a close examination of the tablet does reveal part of the *a* and the end of *ilī*, thus allowing the reconstruction *-ba-a-[a-ti-il]*^{meš} as the end of the divine name. Borger rejects the reading of the first part of the name as *ḏQa ti ba* as a misreading and instead reads *ḏA-ba(qa)-ti...* which, he believes, may be a scribal error for *ḏA-na-ti...* thus giving the divine pair Bethel and Anat-Bethel.

³⁸See the note of Albright (1968 197 n.48) who writes that this Tyrian pantheon gives evidence for Aramaic deities **Bait-'elâhayyâ* and **'Anat-bait-'elâhayyâ*. He further comments, “Some 250 years later these Aramaic gods appear at Elephantine as Bethel and Anath-Bethel”. This is in contradiction to his earlier statements that Bethel and Anatbethel are hypostatizations of Yhw, but is in character with Albright’s continual reassessment of material over the years.

³⁹Completely unconvincing is the hypothesis of du Mesnil du Buisson (1973 45f.) who believes that Bethel and Anat-Bethel should be understood as the Great Mother Goddess and her

hypostatic form) is a surprising one, given the Ugaritic evidence which sees her in close connection with Baal, the temporal and geographical distance from Ugarit allows us a certain fluidity in pantheon structures, and it would be unwise to impose the Ugaritic pantheon model on the entire Canaanite civilisation, contemporary or otherwise.⁴⁰ Roughly a century later we find an Aramaic document which contains theophoric personal names based on the divinity Bethel (Starcky 1960). What the Tyrian and later evidence suggests is that by the middle of the first millennium B.C. Bethel had advanced from the purely subsidiary hypostatisation of the 'house of god/ilu' to become a deity in his own right. When we come to Elephantine, the deity Bethel already has a long history behind him and a flourishing cult centre at Syene (בית בתאל, TADA2.1.1) among the Aramaeans. This evidence does not conclusively demonstrate that Albright is wrong in his assumptions about the meaning of Bethel for the Jewish colony at Elephantine. However, we must ask ourselves what is the probability that this relatively small group of Jews who lived as part of a multi-ethnic and polytheistic community which worshipped Bethel among other deities, would have established the practice of calling their own god by the name Bethel without the risk of confusion between the two. When the Jews of Elephantine spoke of ביתאל it is almost certain that they were aware of the local tradition of the Aramaean deity Bethel worshipped at Syene, but to what extent the Jews identified Yhw and Bethel, or indeed whether they themselves worshipped Bethel, is hard to determine.

If, as seems probable, the Jews and Arameans alike recognised Bethel as a distinct divinity, what can we make of the names אשמביתאל and ענתביתאל found in

daughter. In his opinion, Bethel = (god or goddess) House-of-the-gods, which he takes to be Asherah, and Anat-Bethel signifies that Anat has her residence in the asherah (a cultic object); he writes, "Anat étant fille de Shor ÉI et de l'Ashérat, il est naturel qu'elle demeure dans l'*asherâ*."

⁴⁰See the comments by Clifford (1990).

the donor list TADC3.15? Albright (1925 93) argues for the hypostatic 'Name of God' (= Yhw), but the element שׁמ may be taken as the deity Ashima/Ishum, perhaps referred to in the Samaritan worship of אִשְׁמִיָּה in 2 Kg 17.30 and the אִשְׁמֵת שְׁמֵרֹן of Amos 8.14 (Cowley 1923 xix). Vincent (1937 654f) relates it to the Phoenician Ešmun and rejects the explanation of שׁמ as 'name'; he argues that the noun שׁמ never occurs in Hebrew with a prosthetic aleph, not even in personal names. However, evidence from the Panammuwa inscription⁴¹ and two inscriptions from Sfire⁴² indicate that the Aramaic lexeme שׁמ can mean 'name'.⁴³ On the other hand, onomastic evidence provides us with personal names such as אִשְׁמֵת 'šm gave', אִשְׁמֵר 'šm is exalted' and אִשְׁמֵשׁוּב 'šm rescued', who was father of אִשְׁמֵר .⁴⁴ Whilst evidence from onomastics alone is insufficient for us to be certain, it does at least allow the possibility of a deity 'šm, honoured at Elephantine. The choice between accepting 'Name of Bethel' or 'šm-Bethel' where the latter represents the bringing together of two distinct divinities, is a difficult one to make, especially since 'šm may be a hypostatisation of deity to begin with and therefore have the meaning 'Name'.

As for חֲרֵמֵי הַבַּיִת which Albright (1925 94) takes as 'sacredness, sacred property of the house of God', a case can also be made for taking חֵרֵם as a deity. It appears in nine personal names, three of which come from Elephantine (Porten 1968 app. V), but the same caution applies as with שׁמ discussed above.

⁴¹KAI 214.16, 21. Vincent noted this inscription (656 n.2) but dismissed it as the only instance of שׁמ meaning 'name'.

⁴²KAI 222.C.25 and 223.B.7.

⁴³See Kraeling (1953 90), Milik (1967 567f), Porten (1968 168), Fulco (1992 I.487).

⁴⁴Porten (1968 app. V) lists seven PNs compounded with the element שׁמ .

In the light of the above discussion, what can be said concerning the lexeme 'nt in its Elephantine context? In the collection papyrus (TADC3.15) we find ענתביתאל, and in the oath of Menahem (TADB7.3) we have ענתיהו, and it has been suggested that this kind of construction indicates a connubial relationship between two deities.⁴⁵ We may have the male equivalent of this form in an Aramaic inscription from Saqqara⁴⁶ which is read by Dupont-Sommer (1956) as בעל בעלענות and translated 'Baal husband of Anat' by him.⁴⁷ The difficulty with this example is that it is not grammatically parallel with the Elephantine examples, since it has the substantive b'l 'husband' in construct with the following divine name (unless we understand it as 'Baal, Baal (of) Anat'), whereas our examples may be formed by the apposition of two divine names. If we are to understand the Elephantine divine names as an indication that Anat was the spouse of Bethel and the spouse of Yahu, it may be attractive to equate Bethel with Yahu. Vincent (1937 575) argues that Anat can only be a spouse to one deity, in which case Yahu must be equated with Bethel, and both equated with El. However, it may simply be the case that Yahu acquired Anat as a spouse (and perhaps even 'šm) after the fashion of the Aramaic pair Bethel and Anat, and that the two forms ענתיהו and ענתביתאל may simply be two names for the same goddess; spouse of Yhw and spouse of Bethel, depending on the perspective of the worshipping community, rather than equating יהו with ביתאל. However, if the

⁴⁵See *inter alia* Vincent (1937 622), Dupont-Sommer (1956 85), de Boer (1974 32) who assume the relationship to be of a sexual nature. Kraeling (1953 91) suggests that Anatbethel, who is to be equated with Anatyahu, was the daughter of Bethel and his spouse Eshembethel. Ackroyd (1983 248) is in no doubt that these two constructions are goddesses. He writes, "one point is clear, namely that a title or name Anath-bethel can only denote a female divinity... Even more clearly Anath-Ya'u would appear to be the consort of Ya'u".

⁴⁶The provenance of this piece is unknown since it was acquired from an antiquities dealer. For more details see Dupont-Sommer (1956).

⁴⁷Dupont-Sommer (1956) explains the unusual spelling ענות as a dialectical variant of the more usual spelling ענת. He points to the hb. בית ענת (Josh 15.59) as a variant of the more usual בית ענת (Josh 19.38; Judg 1.33). See Moscati (ed.: 1964 8.83).

theologies behind Yhw and Bethel were seen to be fairly similar, by the Jews at least, then it is possible that the Jews identified these two deities, a process familiar to us from all cultures of the historical Near East.

On the other hand, it has been suggested (e.g. Porten 1968 171) that we compare the forms *ענת־יהו* and *ענת־ביתאֵל* to the forms *'ttrt šm b'l* of KTU 1.16 vi 56, or to the fifth century *עשתרת שם בעל* of the Eshmunazar inscription (KAI 14.18) and to the Punic inscription which mentions *תנת פן בעל* (KAI 78.2). In these terms, Anat would be seen as a hypostatisation of some aspect of the deity, Yhw as well as Bethel, and as such, comes close to Albright's (1925) position. As with the Saqqara example however, these examples thrown up for comparison are not in fact grammatically parallel with our two divine names. In the first case we have *šm* 'name' and in the second *pn* 'face' as a substantive in construct with the second divine name which forms the predicate qualifying the nature of the initial divine name; e.g., 'Ashtart (who is) name of Baal', etc. It could be argued that in the course of time and familiarity the substantive in construct with the second divine name could be dropped with the result that two divine names stand in apposition as in the Elephantine texts; however, without proof of this process it seems prudent to leave these examples out of the discussion.

None of this proves beyond doubt that the lexeme *'nt* is to be taken as the divine name Anat, only that it is a possibility, despite the protestations of Albright. The presence of the personal name *ענתי* is also of an ambiguous nature. It is probably a hypocoristic form of a longer name which may have included a divine element and a predicate, but it is difficult to assess whether its basis, *ענת*, is the divine name in which case it would be a positive affirmation of the worship of the goddess Anat at Elephantine, or the predicate corresponding to the root *'ny*, as Albright contends. However, from those cultures in which it is established that there was an Anat cult, we do find similar names such as *ḥa-na-tum* from Mari and *ⁿAN-IGI^{at}* from the

syllabic texts from Ugarit (see above). Despite these examples, the great gulf of time between them and the Elephantine texts and the divergent cultural context makes it impossible to judge either way, since a development of the hypostatic element '*nt*', whatever it means, could easily have arisen during this long period.

The temporal distance between the pinnacle of Anat worship in Egypt during the nineteenth dynasty and the Elephantine colony of the sixth century B.C. is roughly three quarters of a millennium. However, mention of Anat in Egypt does not cease with the Ramesside period. Apart from the literary contexts in which she appears,⁴⁸ we have several portrayals of the goddess with accompanying inscriptions to verify her identity dating to the nineteenth dynasty. Although of unknown provenance, we also have a bronze situla whose probable date is much closer to the period of the Elephantine colony. It bears a scene very similar to that of the lower register of the British Museum stele (646/191). Anat is identified as 'Anat, mistress of Heaven', and the male worshipper is identified as Psamtik who, according to Grdseloff (1942 28f.), was later to become Pharaoh Psamtik I, thus providing us with a date around the middle of the seventh century B.C. From an even later period (Ptolemaic - Roman) we find a funerary stele which mentions three deities, each connected to a 'House of Anat', possibly a temple for the cult of Anat: 'Anat, Lady of the House of Anat', 'Mut, the Great One, Lady of the House of Anat', and 'Khonsu, the Child, Lord of the House of Anat' (Blok 1930, 182). Thus we catch occasional glimpses of Anat in Egypt from the end of the second millennium down to the end of the first, and we can assume that her cult, or at least the memory of such a cult, did not die out entirely during the first millennium in Egypt.

⁴⁸References to the representations of Anat in literary contexts from Egypt are found in Eaton (1964) and Bowman (1978). See also my discussion on Anat in Egypt.

1.3.2. 'Providence, Will' (*cont.*)

Albright's objections to the lexeme 'nt at Elephantine as a reference to the goddess Anat have been addressed and the possibility that Anat was worshipped at Elephantine can no longer be dismissed out of hand. From the iconographic evidence available to us we see that a cult of Anat had not completely died out in first millennium Egypt, at least down to the Ptolemaic period. Although we cannot be absolutely certain, my interpretation of the evidence is that Anat *was* known as a goddess at Syene and Elephantine and that she was accepted as a spouse of Bethel, by the Aramaeans, and of Yahu by the Jews. This conclusion, however, remains tentative. As for her relative importance within the cult, Porten (1968 177) suggests that we can judge this from the frequency of occurrences of personal names in which her name appears. Since we find it only twice,⁴⁹ he concludes that she did not play a major role in the communal life of the Jews. However, we must tread cautiously at this point. We have already seen the discrepancy between the predominant role of Anat in Ugaritic myth and the relative scarcity of theophorous names with 'nt in either alphabetic cuneiform or Akkadian at Ugarit itself (see above). This warns us against assuming a direct correlation between the frequency of a divine name in theophorous personal names, and the relative importance of that deity within a cultic context. In the specifically Elephantine context, we should not assume that such a low frequency of use in personal names with 'nt necessarily points to a small role in the Jewish cult. However, without the benefit of the range and number of cultic texts comparable to those from Ugarit for example, it is impossible to judge her importance to the Jewish cult.

⁴⁹Grelot 89.107 and one of the Hermopolis letters, TADA2.1.3.

Turning our attention back to Albright's hypothesis on the etymology of the divine name 'nt, we can now judge his position from the clearer picture of the status of the lexeme 'nt in the Elephantine texts available to us. Close examination of the evidence suggests a strong possibility that the goddess Anat was worshipped there and that she had a relationship with אֱנַת־אֱלֹהִים expressed in the divine name אֱנַת־אֱלֹהִים, although exactly what this relationship might be is impossible to determine. We have also seen that the two Hebrew texts which Albright uses to substantiate his claim cannot in any real sense be taken as positive confirmation. As a result, his assumption that 'purpose, providence' was the etymological root behind the divine name Anat must also be rejected.⁵⁰

1.3.3. 'Spring, Source, Well'

Albright (1933 190f.), working on the assumption that Baal and Anat were fertility gods and thus intimately linked to the flow of underground water, remarks that the name of Anat was spelled the same way as the word for 'fountains'. He continues,

That the god who causes rain should have a consort who causes the flow of springs is only natural, especially when we recall that the flow of springs was connected with the sexual secretion of the earth-goddess by a number of ancient Oriental myths and conceptions.

However, although he points on the one hand to an underlying connection between the mythic complex of earth-goddess, sexual secretions and underground water with the lexeme 'nt 'well, spring', and on the other to the fact that this lexeme and the name of Anat are homographs, he does not suggest any etymological connection. In his publication of the tablet RS 22.225 (*KTU* 1.96), Virolleaud (1960

⁵⁰Doubt has been expressed by many scholars over Albright's etymology of Anat, including Stadelmann (1967 88).

181) again points out the similarity between the divine name 'nt, and Ugaritic feminine noun 'n, 'Spring', Hebrew ךַּנְּ. He asserts (185) that Anat, as her name implies (and here he goes further than Albright), had control of the terrestrial waters, whilst Baal, as 'Rider of the Clouds' had control of the clouds which dispense the rain. Virolleaud finds confirmation of his position in lines *KTU* 1.96.5f. which he interprets as a visit by Anat to a group of five springs, although beyond stating that she was in control of terrestrial water, he is unable to give any satisfactory reason for her behaviour. His position here stands in marked contrast to one of his earlier publications in which he discusses the divine name ⁿAN-IGI^{at} (1941). As was seen above, the ideograph IGI can be used for Semitic 'n 'spring' as for example in the place names given by Virolleaud (1940 146). This might be taken as an indication that when used in the divine name 'Anat', this ideograph was chosen because of some relationship between the nature of the goddess and springs. However, as Virolleaud himself writes (1941 9 n.1),

Mais si, dans le n.h. ndŠI^{at}, ŠI^{at} représente effectivement 'nt, il ne s'ensuit pas nécessairement que la déesse 'Anat était une divinité des sources; car... ŠI... a très bien pu être choisi d'une façon tout arbitraire, comme, par exemple, AN-ŠEŠ-KI (idéogr. du dieu Nanna) a été parfois employé, pur sa seule valeur phonétique, indépendamment de toute considération étymologique, pour représenter l'élément *nanna* dans l'adverbe *i-nanna*.

Thus it is clear that this particular form of the divine name cannot be used as evidence for the nature of Anat as a goddess of spring water, and we are left only with Virolleaud's interpretation of *KTU* 1.96 as support for his proposed etymology.

Caquot *et al.* (*TOuI* 87) take up and expand on this idea. They claim that she appears to have rights of ownership over water, although the text they give in demonstration (*KTU* 1.3.ii.38f.) is simply a description of the ablutions of the goddess after her fierce battle described prior to this scene. However, the scene which they believe shows most clearly her position of authority over the waters is seen in *KTU*

1.6.i.17 in which Anat buries the body of her brother, Baal.⁵¹ It is interpreted thus (87),

Nous voyons là l'expression mythique et anthropomorphique d'un phénomène naturel: les sources recueillent les eaux répandues dans la terre.

It is highly questionable, however, that their interpretation of this passage is really so clearly indicated by the text itself which, I believe, is more convincingly seen as part of the mourning rites which the goddess performs for her dead brother. What is the 'clear' connection between burial of a dead body and the mythic notion of the gathering up of rain water by the earth? It is only by accepting the hypothesis that Anat is the ground water and Baal the rain that this kind of interpretation becomes possible, so it would be fallacious to appeal to this text as evidence in support of the hypothesis. The only possible reason for their interpretation is, I suggest, the acceptance of Virolleaud's position on the interpretation of *KTU* 1.96, and this is indicated by the assertion that the most probable etymology for the divine name Anat is the substantive 'n 'spring'. Like Virolleaud, *TOu1* appeals to *KTU* 1.96 in support and, as an example, suggests that the phrase 'Anat eats the flesh of her brother without a knife and drinks his blood without a cup' (*KTU* 1.96.3f. based on *TOu1*'s translation) may mean that Anat the 'Spring', absorbs the substance of her brother, the 'Rain'; Anat follows her actions with an inspection of several springs. This view is restated by Caquot and Sznycer (1980 9) and *TOu2* (41).

The divine name 'nt is graphically equal to the plural substantive 'nt, 'springs', but the semantic equivalence is by no means assured. The possibility that 'n, 'spring', is the etymology of the divine name cannot be ruled out on grammatical grounds alone, but I suspect that the evidence presented in its favour by Virolleaud,

⁵¹The question of whether Anat is the sister of Baal in strict kinship terms, or whether this indicates a sexual relationship between the two, will be discussed below.



and more forcefully by Caquot, is not able to support the hypothesis. Apart from appealing to the graphical similarity of the two lexemes, the only piece of supporting evidence comes from an interpretation of the last section of *KTU* 1.96 which sees in it a description of Anat visiting various springs. However, it is doubtful whether this text actually mentions Anat at all; it is more likely to be an incantation against the effects of the evil eye (see below).

1.3.4. 'Humiliate, Oppress, Do violence to, Torment'

Eaton (1964 101f.) discusses some of the proposed etymologies of the divine name. He suggests that it may have been rooted in the verb *'nh* II, 'to humiliate, oppress, do violence to, torment' (HAL 719), an observation already made as early as de Vogüé (1868 75). According to Eaton, this eminently suits her character as portrayed in such scenes as *KTU* 1.3.ii. It may also be reflected in her Ugaritic epithet *ḥbly* 'destroyer' (*KTU* 1.102.11) and the adoption of this Semitic goddess by the aggressive pharaoh Ramesses II. Of course, the suggestion that the etymology of the goddess is a reflection of her bellicose character pushes back the context of her aggressive behaviour at least to the time of Mari, where we might expect her to be portrayed as the epitome of a violent goddess. However, as we saw above, the type of evidence available to us from Mari makes it very difficult to draw any conclusions concerning the character of the goddess. Eaton warns us that his suggestion is only one of many possibilities and states that the problem of the etymology of the name 'remains unanswerable' (1964 102), and his belief that for the worshipper her name may have encompassed many of these meanings is probably close to the mark.

1.3.5. 'Stream of tears, Dirge'

Kapelrud (1969 27f.) proposes two etymologies for the divine name. On the basis of Hebrew ענה 'answer' he suggests that Anat may have been an oracle goddess (cf. de Vogüé 1868 75). Although Kapelrud himself later dismisses this idea on the basis that no texts depict her as such, it is significant that in the Mari text ARM 8.85 Anat was one of two deities before whom an oath was taken as part of a legal case and here her role could be understood as that of an oracle goddess. On the other hand, her presence may have no more significance than the fact that the oath was taken in her city, and was thus included for this reason alone rather than for any supposed role as an oracle goddess. In fact, her invocation in this text could be used to support the etymology of Eaton (1964; see above) if we believe that Anat was included because she would afflict those who swore falsely before her. However, without further evidence from Mari or Ugarit it is impossible to say anything more than this is yet another possibility.

Kapelrud's second suggestion relates her name to Akkadian *ittu* 'stream of tears, dirge', and alleges that this meaning is also found in Hebrew ענה 'Dirge, to sing, answer singing, howl'. However, an examination of the examples he offers in support of this meaning⁵² reveals a rather different picture.

In Ex. 15.21 the verb ענה is used to describe the action of Miriam. It is possible that this is ענה I 'answer, respond' meaning that Miriam answers the previous song in 15.1f. with one of her own. However, the fact that she is accompanied by a band of women with timbrels and dancing suggests that the verb ענה IV 'sing' (BDB) would be more appropriate. The contents of her song can hardly be taken as a dirge;

⁵²Page 28 he gives the following examples; Ex. 15.21, 32.18; I Sam. 18.7, 21.12, 29.5; Is. 13.22, 27.2; Ps. 119.172 and 147.7.

on the contrary, she is singing about the glorious victory of Yhwh over the Egyptians. In Ex. 32.18 we find the distinction between ענות גבורה and ענות חלושה on the one hand, and ענות on the other.⁵³ In verse 17 Joshua hears the noise in the camp and believes it to be the sound of war (קול מלחמה) to which Moses responds with the statement that it is not the ענות גבורה or the ענות חלושה that can be heard. Perhaps this encompasses two actions that might be expected during battle presumably depending on how the battle was progressing, whilst the third lexeme, ענות, seems to refer to the revelry of the camp. Whilst the phrase ענות חלושה could conceivably be connected with a dirge, in the looser sense of bewailing the rout of the Israelite army, the other two cases of ענה can hardly be associated with a dirge. I Sam. 18.7, 21.12 and 29.5 all use the verb ענה to introduce what is said about Saul and David after battle. It is used alongside the verbs שחק ('laugh', 18.7) and the noun מחילה (used in construct, 'dance', 21.12, 29.5) and clearly pertains to celebratory singing rather than mournful dirges. In Is. 27.2 the verb ענה is used in the opening line of the following poem or song which celebrates, at least in the lines 3-5, the situation of Yhwh having defeated all his enemies. It comes directly after a passage which describes the defeat of the sea-monster by Yhwh, and again the verb is not used in the context of a dirge, but in the celebration of a victory in battle. In Ps. 119.172 and 147.7 ענה is used in the sense of praising Yhwh and in Is. 13.22 it is used to describe the howling of wild animals.

Kapelrud is clearly wrong in his assertion that the Hebrew verb ענה can mean 'dirge'. On the contrary, all the above evidence suggests that whilst the verb שיר is the more general 'sing', ענה is closely associated with the celebratory singing after victory in battle, either real or metaphorical. Only the one instance, Ex. 32.18,

⁵³The LXX reading φωνήν ἐξαρχόντων οἶνου adds the explanatory element that the noise was from drunken revelry, whereas the MT leaves the reader to 'understand' exactly what it was that Moses could hear from the prior description of what was going on in the camp in 32.6.

suggests that it might have been used after defeat, although the obscure nature of this tricolon, the contrasting of גבורה 'strength' with the *hapax* חלושה from the root חלש 'be weak', makes it difficult to be certain.

What Kapelrud appears to be doing is looking for a significant character trait of the goddess and attempting to tie this into an etymology for her name. He devotes a section of his book to the development of the idea of Anat as a "goddess of lamentation and mourning" (82-92), and picks on this characteristic as the one that lies behind the conception of the goddess and hence the etymology of her name. However, his arguments are less than convincing and his proposed etymology cannot be accepted.

1.3.6. 'To Love, Make Love'

Ariella Deem (1978) begins her discussion with the statement that she actively seeks an etymology that reflects the "aspect of love and fecundity" which is the fundamental nature of Anat.⁵⁴ She begins her quest with the observation (26),

In Hebrew the most frequent connotation of the verb ענה in the Piel is "to inflict sorrow or pain". A narrower meaning is "to force a woman to have sexual intercourse", "to rape", which is attested both in legal contexts and in narrative passages.

From her assumption that the "fundamental idea" of the Piel is the intensive or even causative form of a Qal stem,⁵⁵ she argues that if the Piel can mean "rape", then an original Qal would express the more neutral "sexual intercourse by

⁵⁴This view was already stated by Gordon (1977 126 n.83), but he attributed the idea to a Dr. Ariella Goldberg, presumably the same as our Ariella Deem.

⁵⁵She follows GK's explanation of the Piel. This notion of the Piel as the intensive form of a Qal stem is now seen to be over simplified; see the discussion in Waltke and O'Connor (1990 396f.).

mutual consent". Here, she departs from the more common understanding of ענה Piel "rape" as a semantic development or verbal metaphor from the common Piel stem "afflict, humble" and instead sees it as a derivation from a hitherto unnoticed Qal root ענה "to have sexual intercourse". She offers several examples from Hebrew texts in which she sees this Qal stem; however, Good (1987) has convincingly demonstrated that none of Deem's examples withstands close scrutiny, and this seriously weakens her case, for she is then left solely with her somewhat dubious method of working backwards from a Piel stem to a hypothetical Qal form of the verb.

Toward the end of her paper, Deem (1978 29f.) plays the broader game of "tracing the original meaning of names of fertility gods to the imagery and terminology of fecundity". While, as Deem points out, there is undoubtedly a strong tradition of using agricultural imagery when describing sexual activity, her attempt to trace the names of deities back to such imagery is hindered by her confused method and uncritical acceptance of various assumptions concerning the relationship between Semitic deities and nature/fertility religion. To begin with, she simply assumes that Baal and Anat are fertility deities without any attempt to substantiate this claim for Baal, whilst the sum total of the evidence presented for Anat as a fertility goddess is that she engages in sexual intercourse with Baal and bears him a child. However, if sexual intercourse were the sole prerequisite for classifying a god or goddess as a fertility deity, then there would be very few indeed who would escape this classification! Deem's attempt to seek an etymology of the name of Anat which reflects her nature as a fertility goddess rests squarely on the assumption that Anat's nature *is fundamentally* that of a fertility goddess,⁵⁶ but without any examination of the primary hypothesis, she seems to be arguing in a circular fashion: Anat is a fertility

⁵⁶Page 30 she writes, "This etymology relates the name of Anath to one of her main features as the goddess of love and fecundity."

goddess, the etymology which reflects her nature is that of *'nh* 'sexual intercourse', the etymology of her name shows Anat to be a fertility goddess.

A confusion in her method can be seen in the analysis of the etymology of the divine name Baal. She writes (1978 30),

The name of the fertility god, Baal, is on the one hand linked to the verb בעל "to wed, to copulate", and on the other, with an agricultural term with שדה בעל "rain-irrigated field".

This conclusion follows on from her stated goal of "tracing the *original meaning* of names of fertility gods" (emphasis mine); however, in her search for these original meanings, she never moves beyond the horizon of Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew. Surely if we are looking for an 'original' meaning of a divine name, we should at least look for evidence in the earliest literary strata in which the name first occurs, which in the case of Baal means at least looking at the Akkadian and later Ugaritic evidence. There is no example of *b'l* meaning 'copulate, wed' in either of these cognate languages in which the name (or rather 'title') is found; on the other hand there is overwhelming evidence that the earliest examples of *b'l* as a divine name indicate that this is a title meaning 'lord, master' (CAD 2.199). This suggests that the comparatively late evidence of Hebrew shows us a secondary development from the noun בעל 'husband, lord, owner'.

As for the goddess Anat, Deem declares that there is a "similar pattern" connecting the name of Anat with the verb ענה 'to love, make love' and the agricultural term מענה, מענית 'furrow'. Again we may level the same criticism at her method: if she is searching for the *original* meaning of the divine name, she should at least look beyond the horizon of Biblical Hebrew. Good (1987) has clearly shown that there is no evidence for a Hebrew verb ענה 'make love', and neither is there a

comparable verb *'ny* found at Ugarit. With such negative evidence as this, her proposed etymology is doubtful.⁵⁷

1.3.7. 'Furrow'

Deem (1978 30) suggests that the divine name *'nt* is connected to the Ugaritic lexeme *'n* 'furrow', pl. *'nt*, found in *KTU* 1.6.iv.1f. || iv.12f. and *KTU* 1.16.iii.9, although she stops short of accepting this as the etymology of the divine name since it would contradict her earlier proposal. Wyatt (1988 382, following Deem 1978) suggests that 'furrow' is an acceptable etymology, using this and the supposition that *kpt* in *KTU* 1.108 means 'earth' to argue that Anat was an earth goddess. This in turn is linked to his theory that as part of the Baal cycle there is an episode which narrates the rescue of Anat from Yam, on the basis of an Indo-European origin for the plot of this myth. However, in text 1.3.iii.37f. we find a vivid account of Anat annihilating Yam and all his retinue, and this does not fit well with the idea of her being Yam's captive. Wyatt's assessment of *kpt* in 1.108 is possible, although I prefer to relate it to the akk. *kabašu* as a part of her headdress with royal significance.

Korpel (1990 124, 580), however, readily accepts *'nt* 'furrow' as the etymology of the divine name 'Anat', without feeling any discussion is necessary. She states that the "literal meaning" of *'nt* (and therefore of the divine name) is 'furrow', which in turn may have the metaphorical meaning of 'vulva' which thus gives a "sexual background" to the goddess Anat.⁵⁸

⁵⁷Good (1987 137) strangely accepts her etymology for Anat based on a verb **'ny* 'make love', even though he disproves her evidence from Biblical Hebrew.

⁵⁸She also includes in this category of divine names, whose original meaning has something to do with fertile fields, Astarte and Athtar.

It does seem the case that we have an Ugaritic lexeme 'nt with the meaning 'furrow' in *KTU* 1.6.iv. In this text, after a dialogue between El and a figure whose name is now lost (probably Anat), El has a dream in which he sees Baal alive, and then gives Anat the following message which she in turn is to give to Shapshu (*KTU* 1.6.iv.1f.):⁵⁹

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <i>pl. 'nt. šdm. y špš</i> | Search the furrows of the fields, O Shapshu! |
| 2) <i>pl. 'nt. šdm[.] i*l.</i> | Search the furrows of the fields of El! |
| <i>yštk</i> 3) <i>b*'l. *nt. mḥrtt</i> | May Baal be visible in the furrows of the plough land. |
| 4) <i>i*y. aliyn. b'l</i> | Where is Valiant Baal? |
| 5) <i>iy. zb*l. b'l. arš</i> | Where is the Prince, Lord of the earth? |

In fact one could argue that the poet is here playing on the similarity of the divine name and the lexeme 'nt although it may simply be circumstance. What Deem and more especially Korpel attempt is an etymological connection between the divine name and the root 'nt 'furrow', but there is no firm evidence to support this view. As we have already seen, the material from Mari is unable to tell us anything about the character of the goddess at that city, which might provide us with evidence for an earlier period of adoration of this goddess. If Anat began life as the deification of the furrows of the field then this has left little trace in the Ugaritic material, perhaps this passage is the only one that could be used to support such a theory. In my opinion, however, it is better that we see in this passage a poetical technique which brings words together on the basis of aural similitude, rather than a common etymology.

1.3.8. Conclusions

There is a wide diversity of opinion on the etymology of the divine name 'Anat'. As we saw in the first part of this chapter, her name can be traced back to the

⁵⁹See my notes to this text below.

Old Babylonian period at Mari, and this is an important factor that must be taken into account when attempting to trace its etymology. As we have seen, most of the attempts at such an enterprise have relied on establishing a correlation between any outstanding character trait of the goddess witnessed in the Ugaritic narrative material, and an appropriate etymon at least containing the consonants ' and *n*. For example, Virolleaud and Caquot *et al.* believe that Anat is a goddess intimately connected with the life-giving waters of the earth, thus her name is derived from the root '*n* 'spring', whilst for Kapelrud her main role is that of prototypical mourner, in which case her name is ultimately to be derived from Akkadian *ittu* 'stream of tears, dirge', Hebrew ענה 'Dirge'. In my discussion I have attempted to establish the probability of each suggestion, taking into account the presence of appropriate roots in Old Babylonian, and the character of the goddess at Ugarit; in this way we were able, for example, to reject Deem's proposal on the basis that she attempted to establish an etymology based on a Biblical Hebrew root without looking beyond it to Ugaritic or Akkadian cognates. However, even this last criterion is not fool-proof, since it relies on the assumption that the character traits of the goddess Anat at Ugarit were essentially the same as those of the Anat found over 500 years earlier at the distant town of Mari; something which cannot be taken for granted. Even if the contemporary goddesses were essentially the same, there is potentially a wide scope for the development of her character over half a millennium. Unfortunately, we lack the kinds of material which would allow us to build up a picture of the character of the goddess at Mari which renders us unable to cross check Ugaritic Anat with the Anat of Mari.

The character of Anat is complex and no one single etymology would be adequate to encompass the whole; however, many of the proposed etymologies do cover some or other aspect of her character. Perhaps it is best if we accept that whatever was the original etymon of her name, it is beyond our capability with the present evidence to achieve anything more than a reasoned assessment of the

likelihood of any proposed etymology. Furthermore, it is not necessary to believe that the character of Anat would be immutable: even if we did have a reliable portrait of the goddess at Mari, her origins may lie in the pre-literate period for an unknown length of time, during which her character was developed. But this simply pushes the problem back one more step. Perhaps the complexity of her character is a result of the accretion of many layers of 'etymologies' on her name by various groups which were influenced by the similarity of sound between her name and various other lexemes, although we can only speculate about this. Suffice it to say that the name of the goddess could evoke in the mind of the worshipper many images based on aural similitude and that these furnished the goddess with a rich and varied personality.

1.4. CONCLUSIONS

In the first part of this chapter we traced the divine name *'nt* from its earliest known mention in eighteenth century Mari, down to the late twelfth century Ugarit. At Mari the goddess appears as simply another deity in a developed pantheon, exhibiting no outstanding features which allow us to draw any conclusions about her character during this period. It seems very likely that the goddess was West Semitic in origin and was worshipped by the Amorites. There did not seem to be any significant differences between theophoric personal names from this early period, and those from Ugarit.

In the second part of this chapter we traced the various attempts at finding the 'original meaning' of the divine name, and concluded that with the present state of our knowledge it is impossible to make firm conclusions. The presence of Anat at Mari demands that any proposed etymon must take into consideration the Amorite

background of this goddess; however, the lack of information on the character of the goddess at Mari coupled with our limited knowledge of the Amorite language poses a great hindrance. We have therefore limited ourselves to an evaluation of the many different possibilities and to an assessment of their individual merit. As for the search for an all encompassing single etymology for her divine name, it is a distinct possibility that the worshippers of Anat attributed different meanings to her name themselves, since the origin of the goddess was probably at least as obscure to them (if not more so!), as it is to ourselves today.

CHAPTER TWO

EVIDENCE FROM EGYPT

2.1.	Introduction	66
2.2.	Earliest evidence	68
2.2.1.	Brooklyn Papyrus 35.1446	68
2.2.2.	Introduction of Anat into Egypt by the Hyksos	69
2.3.	New Kingdom	71
2.3.1.	Eighteenth Dynasty	71
2.3.1.1.	Granite bowl of Horemheb	71
2.3.2.	Nineteenth Dynasty	74
2.3.2.1.	Chariot team of Sethos I	74
2.3.2.2.	Ramesses II	74
2.3.2.3.	Anat and Ramesses II (seated)	75
2.3.2.4.	Anat and Ramesses II (standing)	76
2.3.2.5.	Anat and Ramesses II (Brooklyn Museum 54.67)	77
2.3.2.6.	Northern Obelisk of Ramesses II from Tanis	77
2.3.2.7.	Limestone door post of Ramesses II from Tanis	79
2.3.2.8.	Marriage Stele of Ramesses II	79
2.3.2.9.	Two stelae of Ramesses II	80
2.3.2.10.	Pap. Chester Beatty VII	81
2.3.2.11.	Other references dated to Ramesses II	84
2.3.2.12.	Column from Heliopolis	85
2.3.2.13.	Rhind ostrakon	86
2.3.2.14.	British Museum Stele 646/191	87
2.3.2.15.	Michaélidis ostrakon	88
2.3.3.	Twentieth Dynasty	89
2.3.3.1.	Medinet Habu	89
2.3.3.2.	Stele from Beth Shan	90
2.3.3.3.	Winchester College relief	92
2.3.3.4.	Later Ramesside References	93
2.3.4.	References dated to the Ramesside era	93
2.3.4.1.	Papyrus Chester Beatty I	93
2.3.4.2.	Harris Magical Papyrus	95
2.3.4.3.	Papyrus Leiden I 343 + 345 (Ramesside)	98
2.4.	First Millennium References	101
2.5.	The Iconography of Anat	104
2.5.1.	Identified Iconography	104
2.5.2.	Anonymous Iconography	109
2.5.2.1.	Relief from the Michaélidis Collection	109
2.5.2.2.	Stele from Deir el-Madineh	111
2.5.2.3.	Silver Vase from Bubaste	111
2.5.2.4.	Cylinder Seal RS 5.089	112
2.5.2.5.	Ivory Panel from Ugarit	115
2.5.2.6.	Stele from Temple of Amenhotep III Beth Shan	118
2.5.2.7.	Bronze axe-head from Al-Biqâ	119
2.5.2.8.	'Anat' stele from Ugarit RS 2.[038]	120
2.5.2.9.	Bronze figure from Tel Dan	122

2.5.2.10. Balou'ah Stele	123
2.5.2.11. Bronze of Couple in Chariot	123
2.5.2.12. Goddess with Atef Crown.....	124
2.5.2.13. Bronze of Goddess wearing Atef Crown	124
2.6. Discussion.....	126
2.6.1. Iconography.....	126
2.6.2. Anat's Relationship with the Pharaoh	127
2.6.3. Anat in Egyptian myth.....	131
2.7. Conclusions.....	134

2.1. INTRODUCTION

An important source of information on the goddess Anat comes from Egypt, in the form of personal names, monumental representations and inscriptions, stelae, and myths. A detailed account of the Egyptian evidence for Anat has been given by Eaton (1964) and Bowman (1978). I include in this chapter a discussion of the iconography of the goddess which includes material whose provenance is other than Egypt. However, since all of the named representations of the goddess are Egyptian in origin or style, I think it is appropriate to include such a discussion as part of the overall picture of Anat's place in Egyptian theology.

Anat's popularity reached its zenith in royal circles during the reign of Ramesses II, although we find references to her at many points, both before and after this king, from the Middle Kingdom to the Greek-Roman period.¹ However, a word of caution should be raised here. It would be all too easy to supplement the Ugaritic character of Anat by recourse to Egyptian evidence, and *vice versa*, without thinking about the theological context in which she operates in each culture. By the time of the New Kingdom, Egyptian theology had already a great and prestigious antiquity, with a vivid and lively mythology of its own indigenous creation. Even if we find some traces of Semitic influence in Egyptian myth, we should not forget that it is highly probable that any foreign god or myth adopted by the Egyptians will have been heavily influenced by Egyptian theology. What we are looking at in the Egyptian material, especially that produced by the temples or royal cult as opposed to privately

¹From a chronological point of view, there is no question that the Amorite Anat we find at Mari (see above) is prior to any mention of Anat in Egypt.

produced material, is an *Egyptian* Anat.² Where we see similarities between this Anat and the one we know from Ugarit, we can confidently assume that these traits have been taken on board by the Egyptians as part of the essential character of Anat; where there are contradictions, we should not expect to be able to marry the two together. When we are exposed to aspects of her character which appear only in one cultural context but not the other, then we have to handle the material very carefully in order not to confuse what is primarily the product of two cultures. Even though there are gaping holes in our knowledge of the character of Anat from both cultures, we should not create a composite picture of the goddess on the assumption that what has been lost to us from one culture has been miraculously preserved in the other. On the other hand, nor should we restrict the character of Anat to the 'common core' that we can extract by comparing the two pictures with which we are presented. Recent studies (Walls 1992, Wiggins 1993) have stressed the importance of taking cultural context into consideration when dealing with disparate evidence for the character of a goddess. However, there is not an inseparable gulf between the goddess Anat in Egypt and Anat at Ugarit; we must recognise that she has been first adopted and then adapted to her new cultural context in Egypt. It is with this caution firmly in the forefront of our minds that we engage the Egyptian material.

²Already recognised by Virolleaud (1937 5) who writes that Anat in Egypt is, "d'origine phénicienne, mais devenue réellement égyptienne".

2.2. EARLIEST EVIDENCE

2.2.1. Brooklyn Papyrus 35.1446

The divine name Anat first comes to our attention in Egypt at the end of the Middle Kingdom (Eaton 1964 24; Leclant 1975 253; Bowman 1978 224) in the Brooklyn Papyrus 35.1446. This document consists of a fragment of a criminal register, 2 royal orders, a list of slaves and an act of donation (*LÄ* IV.694), and supplies us with a list of 95 slaves, 37 of which are labelled Semitic:³ '3*m.w* for 'male Asiatic', and '3*m.t* for 'female Asiatic' (Albright 1954 223). Two names, #25 and #59 in Albright's list, are believed to be formed with the divine element Anat: #25 is a female Asiatic 'nt[]' and #59, also female, is called 'n-ti. The second of the two certainly appears to be a hypocoristicon of the divine name, whereas the lacuna of the first makes it impossible to establish the original form of this personal name.

The early date⁴ of this papyrus places it slightly later than the latest attestation of the goddess from Mari which, as we saw above, has a *terminus ad quem* of around 1760 B.C. It also provides evidence for an Anat cult in an area further west than that of Mari. However, the evidence of foreign slave names in Egypt does not allow us to suppose that there was an Anat cult in Egypt at this time, but merely that some foreign slaves were devotees of the goddess in their original circumstances. Whether or not they continued their devotion to Anat in their new circumstances, we have no further indication of an Egyptian reverence for this West Semitic goddess.

³*LÄ* IV.694 claims 48 Asiatic names.

⁴Albright (1954 223) states that the papyrus is dated to the first and second regnal year of Sekhemre Sewadjetawi Sebekhatpe III, which he places around 1740 B.C.; at any rate, the papyrus is to be dated to the end of the Middle Kingdom (*LÄ* IV.694).

2.2.2. Introduction of Anat into Egypt by the Hyksos

The introduction of an actual cult of Anat into Egypt is believed to have taken place during the penetration of the Hyksos⁵ into the Eastern delta (Albright 1925 83; Bérard 1952 24; Eaton 1964 24; Leclant 1975 254; Bowman 1978 223). This is seen from the evidence of personal names on a group of scarabs on which the names are prefaced by the phrase *ḥk3ḥ3s(w)t*, 'Ruler of a foreign country' (Ward 1984). '*nt-hr*⁶' is known from two scarabs (Montet 1941 81 fig. 31; Martin 1971 #349-350) and has been translated 'Anat is content' (e.g., Blok 1930 183; Montet 1941 81) based on the Egyptian verb *hrw* 'be pleased, satisfied, content' (Faulkner 1972 159). Uncertainties still remain in our understanding of the evolution of the system of transcription of foreign names from Middle Kingdom scribes to those of the New Kingdom, but since the Hyksos appear to have been West Semitic, the suggestion that the element *hr* in such names as '*nt-hr*', *y'qb-hr* and *sm3hr* is a West Semitic root is not unreasonable. Ward (1976) has suggested that the element *hr* is Semitic 'mountain', and that the name '*nt-hr*' should be translated 'Anat is my mountain', where 'mountain' is a synonym for 'god'. He compares this to names formed with the element *sr*.⁷ A very similar name is found from a later period at Karnak, where in an inscription on the temple wall we learn that Sethos I named his horse team '*nty-t-hrty*'. Here the second element is spelled with the feminine ending,

⁵Although there has been debate on the ethnic identity of the Hyksos, it is now generally accepted that they were of West-Semitic origin (van Seters 1966 190; Kempinski 1985; Redford and Weinstein 1992).

⁶Newberry (1906 pl. 23, no. 11), Petrie (1906 68), Albright (1925 83), Blok (1930 183), Dussaud (1934 119), Ranke (1935-52 II.272 #10); Montet (1941 81 fig.34), Bérard (1952 24-25), Van Seters (1966 178), Martin (1971 #349 and #350), Leclant (1975 255 n.3), Bowman (1978 224), Redford and Weinstein (1992 343).

⁷cf. Huffmon (1965 258) for Amorite names at Mari with the element *sr*, 'rock, mountain'. Albright (1935 191 n.59) points to the use of elements such as *sr*, *sl*, '*bn*', and *hr* as the divine element in Israelite personal names.

but rather than thinking that this inscription is the correct spelling of the name 'nt-hr (Albright 1925 83 n.9), perhaps we should see this second occurrence as an *Egyptian* name, 'Anat is content', whilst the former is an Egyptian transcription of a Semitic personal name.

University College London seal no. 11655 has been read in two different ways; 'pr-'nt,⁸ or wsr-'ntj.⁹ It is preceded by the phrase *ḥk3ḥ3s(w)t*, 'Ruler of a foreign country' which places it as one of the Royal Name scarabs (Ward 1984), probably used by a local chief during the Hyksos period. The second reading could mean 'strong one of Anat' or 'Anat is powerful'¹⁰ if we accept it as the Egyptian root wsr (Faulkner 1972 68), although an Egyptian root for 'pr is more problematical for a personal name. On the other hand, if we were to understand this name as Semitic, the first element has been shown to be cognate with Akkadian *epēru* by Albright (1954 225) who translates the similar names 'pr-el and 'pr-b'l as 'fosterling of DN'.¹¹ Although the root *epēru* is East Semitic, the use of ' at the beginning of the root would suggest a transcription from a root with initial *ayin*, and hence a West Semitic cognate of the East Semitic root. The West Semitic basis of this personal name is understandable given that the bearer of this name was likely to have been a local West Semitic ruler, rather than proposing a purely Egyptian name.

⁸Petrie (1917 pl. XXI 15th D #1), Martin (1971 #318), Ward (1984 169), Redford and Weinstein (1992 343).

⁹Petrie (1917 pl. XXI 15th D #1), Leclant (1975 255 n.3), Ward (1984 169), Redford and Weinstein (1992 343). Redford and Weinstein (1992) confuse the issue by assuming that these are two different names found on scarabs (numbers 2 and 4 in their list p.343), whilst in fact, we have one scarab and two alternative readings of the same name. This can be seen from the plate in Petrie (1917, 15th D #1) which is in fact identical to that in Martin (1971 pl.41.3).

¹⁰When used as a predicate, the adjective comes before its subject and is invariable in gender and number (Gardiner 1957 47). Thus we would not expect a feminine ending on the adjective wsr when used as a predicate of the divine name 'nt.

¹¹AHw (I.223), *epēru(m)*, 'verköstigen, versorgen'.

2.3. NEW KINGDOM

2.3.1. Eighteenth Dynasty

The acceptance of foreign deities such as Reshef, Astarte, Baal, and Anat, into the official Egyptian pantheon seems to have followed the renewed contacts by the Egyptian administration with its Asiatic neighbours following the expulsion of the Hyksos (Leclant 1960 3), and was perhaps aided by the concern for quickly asserting its legitimacy in Lower Egypt by the adoption of cults already practised at the Hyksos capital, Avaris. Despite an initial aversion to mentioning the Semitic storm god Baal during the 18th Dynasty, by the 19th Dynasty he became firmly established under the guise of Seth (te Velde 1977 119f.) to the point that Seth himself could be portrayed in a truly Semitic fashion¹² and the name 'Baal' itself was written with the Seth animal determinative. As for the goddess Anat, nothing has yet been found that would indicate a flourishing cult,¹³ although a stone bowl of unknown provenance does mention her as one among several Semitic deities who had been assimilated into the Egyptian pantheon of Memphis (Redford 1973).

2.3.1.1. Granite bowl of Horemheb

This granite bowl, which was seen by Redford in a dealer's shop in Cairo and which has no archaeological provenance and no guarantee of authenticity, had the following inscription around its rim (Redford 1973 37),

¹²Cf. the '400 year stele', te Velde (1977 124). See Yon (1991 328 fig.8b).

¹³The supposed presence of a priesthood at Thebes during the reign of Thutmose III (Blok 1930 184; Eaton 1964 25) is disputed by Leclant (1975 255 n.4).

Regnal year 16 under the Majesty of the Lord of the Two Lands, Horemheb, the Ruler; at the time of his first victorious campaign, from Byblos as far as the land of the vile chief of Carchemish. An offering-which-the-king-gives (to) Ptah South-of-His-Wall, Lord of the Life of the Two Lands, (to) Astarte lady of heaven, (to) 'Anat the daughter of Ptah, lady of truth, (to) Resheph lord of heaven, (to) Qodsha lady of the stars of heaven; that they may give life, prosperity and health to the *k3* of the stablemaster of the Lord of the Two Lands Sen-nefer, repeating life.

If the information given is correct, then this mention of Anat comes at the very end of the 18th dynasty, although her designation as 'daughter of Ptah' would suggest that a cult of this goddess had existed at Memphis long enough at least for her to have been accepted into the Memphite pantheon as a daughter of the high god. The fact that here she is the daughter of Ptah whilst in pBeatty I and pBeatty VII she is the daughter of Ra may be a result of the relative novelty of this goddess in Egyptian theology whose familial position had not yet been fixed, but more probably is a reflection of the rival theologies of Memphis and Heliopolis. This same kind of ambiguity surrounds the identity of Astarte's father who is Ra in pBeatty I, but Ptah in pAmherst.¹⁴

Redford suggests that after the campaigns of Thutmose III, there was an influx of Asiatics into Egypt, and that foreign cults had particular patronage under Ptah of Memphis (cf. te Velde 1977 122f.), and this seems borne out by the inscription of this bowl. In it, we find four Semitic gods mentioned, and if we separate Reshef (as the only male Semitic deity) from Qedeset,¹⁵ Astarte and Anat, we arrive at a grouping identical to that found on the Winchester College stele which portrays a goddess of the Qedeset type but with a name which includes these three goddesses. However, in the granite bowl inscription it is very unlikely that the three goddesses are considered in any syncretistic way since they are each given an epithet, and the

¹⁴Gardiner (1932), *ANET* (17f.), Leclant (1975a 500).

¹⁵On this goddess and her alleged associations with Athirat see Wiggins (1991).

group has Reshef inserted into it. In this case, I believe we are dealing with three quite separate and distinct goddesses.

Whilst three of the deities have epithets which betray an astral association, 'lord/lady of (the stars of) heaven', Anat is called 'daughter of Ptah, Mistress of truth'. Elsewhere, Anat receives the title 'Mistress of Heaven', and we are faced with the question of the significance of her epithet here. If the suggested date for this piece is correct, then it would be the first mention of Anat as a goddess in her own right rather than as the divine element in theophorous personal names. Although the Amorite influx into Egypt may have initially introduced Anat worship into Egypt, there is no indication from the 18th dynasty that this was ever taken up by the Egyptians themselves, apart from this bowl. It is possible that Anat was not accepted into the Memphite pantheon until quite late in this period, and if that were the case, she would not have been subjected to a long process of Egyptianisation; in other words, she may at this early point have retained a large part of her Semitic character. The Ugaritic Anat is consistently portrayed as a young goddess (a *btlt*), a daughter of El, with whom she co-operates but also argues. Perhaps this strong father-daughter relationship, not as pronounced with any other goddess, was considered an essential part of the goddess' character by the Egyptians and is thus one of the defining features of her role in Egyptian theology, hence her characterisation as daughter of Ptah, and later as daughter of Ra.

Even if we accept this bowl at face value, it does not provide evidence for any royal cult of Anat at the end of the 18th dynasty since the dedication is by a Sennefer, stable master of the king. It is not until we reach the 19th dynasty that we find evidence for Anat in a royal context.

2.3.2. Nineteenth Dynasty

2.3.2.1. Chariot team of Sethos I

In the panel on the northern wall of the great Hypostyle Hall at Karnak we read of the march through southern Palestine by Sethos I (Panel 1). Over the horses of the Pharaoh's chariot is the inscription,¹⁶

First Great (Chariot-) Span of His Majesty, 'Amun decrees him Valour',
which is (also) named 'Anath is Content'

Here we find the first indication of the warrior role Anat is to play so strongly in Egyptian theology, although here it is the horse team leading Sethos I into battle which bears her name, rather than the goddess being directly involved with the king. The connection of Anat with horses is unusual in that it is usually Astarte who is thought to have intimate associations with the horse (Leclant 1960; Wyatt 1984 334f.). For the reading 'Anat is content', compare the Hyksos name '*nt-hr*' discussed above. A possible military connotation for this name could be sought in the Ugaritic myth *KTU* 1.3.ii where we read that Anat slaughters until she is sated (*šb'*), although I doubt that such an influence was at work here.

2.3.2.2. Ramesses II

During the reign of Ramesses II, son of Sethos I, the official cult of Semitic deities seems to have peaked.¹⁷ We find many references to Anat which date

¹⁶Breasted (1906 III.43 #84), Albright (1925 82f.), Stadelmann (1967 94), Eaton (1964 26), Leclant (1975 254), Bowman (1978 225), Kitchen (1993 6)

¹⁷By 'official' I mean that a temple received funds from the royal purse, or that cultic images were commissioned by the king or priesthood. In other words, the king's personal religion, funded by the immense resources he could command.

to his exceptionally long reign.¹⁸ For example, a sword of Ramesses II is given the name 'Anat-is-Victorious' (Albright 1925 83; Eaton 1964 26; Bowman 1978 225), and on the Bet El-Walli Temple a dog of his is called 'Anat-is-Protection' (Breasted 1906 III 201, #467; Albright 1925 83; Ranke 1935-52 I.69 #15; Eaton 1964 26; Stadelmann 1967 94; Leclant 1975 254; Bowman 1978 225). Even his eldest daughter is given the purely Semitic name *bnt*-'*nt*', 'Daughter of Anat' (Gauthier 1908-14 III.102-103; Block 1930 185; Ranke 1935-52 I.96 #17, II.277 #5; Eaton 1964 28; Stadelmann 1967 94; Leclant 1975 254; Bowman 1978 225; Kitchen 1982 40; Lalouette 1985 172), that is, the divine name '*nt*' prefixed with the Semitic noun *bnt* 'daughter' rather than the usual Egyptian noun *s3t*, 'daughter' (Faulkner 1972 207). Compare this to the name of the father-in-law of Si-Montu, the 23rd son of Ramesses II, who was a Syrian ship's captain called *bn*-'*nt*' (Ranke 1935-52 I.96 #17; Eaton 1964 28; Kitchen 1982 111).

2.3.2.3. Anat and Ramesses II (seated)

Several monuments have been found at Tanis which give us our first glimpse of the image of Anat as portrayed by Egyptian artists, and which illustrate the close relationship between Anat and Ramesses II. The life size seated group of Ramesses II and Anat in grey granite, found in the so-called 'Temple of Anat' on the axis of the temple facing the monumental door (Montet 1933 107; Stadelmann 1967 92; Uphill 1984 69) shows them seated side by side, the right arm of the goddess resting protectively on the shoulder of the king (Montet 1933 107f. pl. XLVII, 2, LIV, LV, 2). Anat wears a skirt whose fabric is clearly seen between her lower calves

¹⁸Although the exact dates for the accession to the throne, and the later death, of Ramesses II are not certainly established, it is generally agreed that his was an exceptionally long reign. For example, Kitchen (1982 240f.) gives the dates 1279/1278 to 1213 (55/56 years), whilst Lalouette (1985 108) gives the date of his accession 1296 BC. and a reign of 67 years, "l'un des plus longs et des plus prestigieux de l'histoire de la vallée du Nil".

and which may begin at her waist, although this is not clear. Around her neck appears to be a collar¹⁹ of some sort and she wears the horned atef crown, which completely covers her hair. It is also noteworthy that she bears no weapons. On this group, Anat is given the title, 'Anat, Mistress of heaven, Lady of the gods of Ramesses-beloved-of-Amun' (Montet 1933 108; Stadelmann 1967 92; Leclant 1975 254). On the rear we have a fragment of a discourse of Anat addressed to Ramesses II. In the first line she addresses him as 'my beloved son', whilst in the next line she declares, 'I am your mother' (Montet 1933 108; Stadelmann 1967 92). This introduces a new element into our picture of Egyptian Anat. She is the daughter of the high god, but she is also the mother of the king, an ideology completely at home among the Egyptians.

2.3.2.4. Anat and Ramesses II (standing)

A second life size group depicting Ramesses II and Anat in pink granite was found outside the vestibule of the 'Temple of Anat', the upper portion was found a few metres outside the northern entrance, facing the monumental doorway, whilst the remainder was found a further two metres away (Montet 1933 125-126 pl. LXX-LXXII; Stadelmann 1967 92; Leclant 1975 254; Uphill 1984 65; Lalouette 1985 147f.). Unlike the previous statue group, this one is in a very poor state of preservation: not only is it broken into several pieces, but the left arm and head of the goddess is missing. Although the group is now damaged, an inscription identifies Ramesses II and Anat as the couple standing side by side and holding hands. The goddess wears a collar similar to that in the previous group, along with a tight fitting robe which falls to her feet and is held tight at the waist by a belt. Unfortunately, due to the poor state of preservation, we are unable to know what the head or any headdress may have looked like. We can see that nothing is held in her right hand

¹⁹For wonderful colour photographs of collars and other Egyptian jewellery, cf. Aldred (1978).

since it holds the hand of Ramesses, but it is impossible to know what might have been held in her left hand, although a comparison with the previous group suggests that she was unarmed. Ramesses has the title, 'beloved of Anat of Ramesses-beloved-of-Amun' on both side panels of the group (Montet 1933 125; Stadelmann 1967 92). On the rear we find a speech of Anat addressed to Ramesses II. In line 1, Anat declares, 'I am your mother'; in line 2 she states that she has given the Pharaoh all lands and that she will stand by him, and in line 4 Ramesses is given the title, 'Beloved of Anat, Mistress of the Heavens' (Montet 1933 125; Stadelmann 1967 92; Lalouette 1985 147).

2.3.2.5. Anat and Ramesses II (Brooklyn Museum 54.67)

One further relief, of unknown provenance, depicts Anat and Ramesses II. The fragmentary Brooklyn Museum relief 54.67 (Brooklyn Museum 1956 27-28 pl. 51-52; Leclant 1975 254) depicts the headdress, head and shoulders of Anat who is described in the accompanying inscription as 'Anat of Ramesses, Mistress of Heaven'. From what remains, we can see that Anat wears the white crown flanked with feathers, a collar and bands at the top of her arms. Ramesses II wears the blue crown. They both face to their right. The epithet 'Anat of Ramesses' is one found already at Tanis, and the similarity in iconographic style between Anat on this fragment, and Anat in the standing group from Tanis, suggests that the original provenance of this piece was Tanis, although this must remain conjectural.

2.3.2.6. Northern Obelisk of Ramesses II from Tanis

On the hidden face of the northern obelisk at Tanis, uncovered by Montet (1933 70), Ramesses II describes himself in the following terms, 'A mighty heart in

combat, Montu in battle, *mhr* of Anat, bull of Seth²⁰ (Stadelmann 1967 93; Leclant 1975 254; Bowman 1978 228; Uphill 1984 #T.249). The full text of all four sides of the obelisk reads (Montet 1933 70):

1. The fascinating lion, full of rage, who has subjugated the land of Shasu, and conquered the mountain of Sâri with his valiant arm. 2. Who strikes the land of Asia, crushes the Nine Bows, reduces all the foreign lands to nothing. 3. Young of face, thanks to the strength of his arm...? bull... 4. A mighty heart in combat, Montu in battle, nursling [*mhr*] of Anta, bull of Seth.

Opinion is divided in the translation of the lexeme *mhr*. On the one hand it could be a Semitic loan-word meaning 'warrior',²¹ or on the other, it may be an Egyptian word meaning 'nursling, suckling'. I shall discuss this problem below. The northern obelisk was one of a pair, and to put it in its proper perspective we need to compare the text of the southern obelisk (Montet 1933 72; Uphill 1984 #T.250):

1. Valiant like Montu, bull son of a bull, who tramples on every land and massacres their inhabitants. 2. His victories extend over every land like those of Seth whose terror dominates the field of battle. The two gods are on his shoulders. 3. Wise in battle, first in battle, who has conquered the land of Nubia by his valour, and subjugated the Libyans. 4. Great of valour like Seth, bull in Retenou, who conquers every land with his arm and brings back to Egypt.

Although the northern obelisk has suffered particular damage, we can see that Ramesses II has put great stress in these two obelisks on his identity with Montu, and to a lesser extent with Anat and Seth. This should not be surprising since they commemorate his victories over foreign lands, and the pharaoh has claimed the patronage and support not only of the Egyptian warrior god Montu, but also that of the gods of the lands he assaulted such as Semitic Baal, in the form of Seth, and the Semitic warrior goddess Anat. Whatever we decide for a translation of *mhr*, it is clear

²⁰Gardiner's (ed. 1935 61 n.1) understanding of the phrase 'the great cow (?) of Seth' as an epithet of Anat is untenable in the light of parallel inscriptions which make it clear that what was intended was an epithet of Ramesses as a 'bull of Seth' (Couroyer 1964 453f.).

²¹Compare Ugaritic *mhr*, *KTU* 1.3.ii.15, 1.18.iv.26, etc.

from the overall context that Anat's prowess as a warrior is the reason for her inclusion. As mother of the king, her bellicose nature becomes assimilated to that of Ramesses II, endowing him with divine strength and protection.

2.3.2.7. Limestone door post of Ramesses II from Tanis

One final piece from Tanis is a fragment of a limestone door post that had been reused in the sacred lake walling in the great temple enclosure (Montet 1966 38 pl. III, 2, XLII, 2; Leclant 1975 254; Uphill 1984 61). An inscription reads, '...he made it as a monument to (his) mother Anta of Ramesses, he made ...'. Note the lack of the third masculine singular pronominal suffix after 'Mother' (Uphill 1984 61).

2.3.2.8. Marriage Stele of Ramesses II

Moving away from Tanis, several other monuments illustrate the close relationship that existed between Ramesses II and the goddess Anat. The 'Marriage Stele' of Ramesses II celebrates his marriage to a young Hittite princess. This has been reconstructed from four different monuments by Kuentz (1925). In line 12, part of a much longer eulogy to Ramesses II, we read (Kuentz 1925 228; Stadelmann 1967 93; Bowman 1978 228; Lalouette 1985 147),

Living image of Re, symbol of He who resides in Heliopolis; the One whose hairs are gold, whose bones are silver, whose limbs are iron; son of Seth, *mhr* of Anat; powerful Bull like Seth of Ombos...

According to Kuentz (1925 197), nothing can be read from the Karnak inscription at this point, but line 14 of the Elephantine text reads *mhr* '*nt(i)*' with feminine ending and goddess determinative, whereas line 12 of the Abu-Simbel text reads *mhr* '[' *r(i)*' with feminine ending and goddess determinative. The discrepancy between the two readings is overcome, however, by comparison with the 'abridged' version of the marriage stele (Lefebvre 1925; Lalouette 1985 147). Here in line 3 we clearly see *mhr* '*nt*', with a goddess determinative in the form of a seated goddess with

atef crown, feathers and horizontal curly horns, holding an ankh on her knees. It seems then that as on the northern obelisk at Tanis, Ramesses II is described as *mhr* 'nt, and that like the other monument, the phrase *mhr* 'nt appears in the larger context of the valiant warrior nature of the Pharaoh.

2.3.2.9. Two stelae of Ramesses II

In the region of the Suez Isthmus, on the caravan route from Suez to Wadi Tumeilat, we find two stelae erected by Ramesses II (Clédat 1918 204f.; Dussaud 1934 119; Goyon 1938; Bérard 1952 23 n.7; Eaton 1964 27; Stadelmann 1967 93; Leclant 1975 254; Bowman 1978 227). On no. 2757²² we find what may be the divine name [*'n*]²³ as well as that of Baal and Soped, whilst on no. 2758 we find the divine names of Anat, Seth and Soped (Clédat 1918). On no. 2758 (left side) we find the very damaged remains of a speech of Anat addressed to Ramesses II, which is translated by Goyon (1938 121) as follows,

- 1 Dit par Anta...
- 2 Je t'ai mis au monde comme Seth (ou Baal) pour...
- 3 Tu te lèves comme un taureau florissant... pour protéger l'Égypte, roi du Sud et du Nord, fils de Ra, Ramsès... je t'ai donné la terre des Chasou...
- 4 ...roi du Sud et du Nord, fils de Ra, Ramsès, gratifié de vie, aimé d'Anta, dame du Ciel...

In Goyon's (1938 122) interpretation of line two of this inscription, Anat is the mother of Seth, rather than what he sees as her usual relationship with him as wife. However, a husband-wife relationship between Anat and Seth is unknown from any other Egyptian material, and I prefer to interpret this line as a statement that Anat

²²The identification numbers are those given by Goyon (1938).

²³Followed by the determinative of seated goddess.

is the mother of Ramesses II (cf. Tanis material) and that she has borne him so that he is like Seth in his role as warrior and conqueror of foreign lands. On the right hand side of this stele, Ramesses II is also addressed as the beloved son of Seth, which is identical language to that found in the Marriage stele. I am not sure how far we should accept such language at face value, with Ramesses II considering himself the divine product of a sexual encounter between Anat and Seth, although such rhetoric places the Pharaoh firmly in the realm of the gods, with attributes of divine strength and valour in battle.

2.3.2.10. Pap. Chester Beatty VII

The papyrus Chester Beatty VII (BM 10687) represents the central section of a book of magical incantations that was probably written at some point during the reign of Ramesses II (Gardiner [ed.] 1935 61f.). The traditional interpretation of spell number 23, a spell against the poison of a scorpion sting, is that it begins with a narrative describing how Seth raped Anat as she bathed at the shore (*hp*), but the seed flew to his forehead and he fell ill.²⁴ Anat then goes to Ra to plead for Seth's return to health, but Seth is finally healed by Isis in the form of a Nubian woman. The translation of Gardiner (1935 61) begins as follows:

[The goddess Anat was disporting?] herself in the (stream of) Khap and bathing in the (stream of) Hemket. Now the great god had gone forth to walk, and he [beheld Seth as he mounted?] upon her back, leaping (her) even as a ram leaps, and covering her even as a ... covers [a] ... [Then some of the seed-poison (?) flew] to his forehead to the parts of the brows of his eyes. Thereupon he lay down upon his bed in his house [being ill..]

Gardiner's reconstruction of the scene as a rape of Anat by Seth, witnessed by Ra, has been followed by many later scholars (e.g. Albright 1968 112; Bowman 1978 237). However, the lacuna at the beginning of the text means that we

²⁴Compare the emergence of the moon-god from the forehead of Seth after he had been impregnated by the seed of Horus in the Contendings of Horus and Seth (te Velde 1977 43f.).

cannot be sure that the bathing goddess is Anat; indeed, a restoration of the divine name Anat raises a problem of consistency since it is Anat herself who acts as intermediary between Seth and Ra in her efforts to free Seth from the effects of the seed/poison, even though she is thought to be the victim of Seth's sexual aggression at the beginning of the narrative.

Roccati (1972), who collated pBeatty VII with an ostrakon from the Ramesseum and a fragment from the Turin museum, has convincingly shown that it is not Anat who should be restored in the initial lacuna of pBeatty VII, but that it is the personified seed/poison (*mtwt*) who is bathing and with whom Seth has sexual intercourse. Further work by van Dijk (1986), who includes fragments published by G. Posener, has reinforced the interpretation of Roccati. His new collation of the text reads as follows:²⁵

[The Seed took a bath] on the shore in order to purify herself in the *Hmkt*. Then the Great God²⁶ went out for a walk and he [perceived her (and saw) her beauty because of (?) the girdle] of her buttocks. Then he mounted her like a ram mounts, he covered her like a [bull] covers. [Thereupon the seed] flew up to his forehead, to the region of his eyebrows, and he lay down upon his bed in his house [and was ill. Hur]ried Anat, the Victorious Goddess, the woman who acts like a warrior, who wears a skirt like men and a sash (?) like women, to Pre', her father. He said to her: "What is the matter with you, Anat, Victorious Goddess, who acts as a warrior, who wears a skirt like men and a sash (?) like women? I have ended (my course) in the evening and I know that you have come to ask that Seth be delivered from the Seed. [Look], let (his) stupidity be a lesson (to him). The Seed had been given as a wife to the God Above, that he should copulate with her with fire after deflowering her with a chisel." Said the divine Isis: "I am a Nubian woman. I have descended from heaven and I have come to uncover the Seed which is in the body [of X son of Y], and to make him go in health to his mother like Horus went in health to his mother Isis. X son of Y shall be (well), for as Horus lives so shall live X son of Y....

²⁵The translation is based on the version of pBeatty VII. Text broken in pBeatty VII but restored from pTurin is given in brackets. Text in italics indicates text absent from all sources.

²⁶The pTurin variant, 'Seth' demonstrates that 'the Great God' is not Ra as Gardiner supposed but Seth (van Dijk 1986 35).

In this new collation of the text it appears that Seth is seduced by the hypostatic goddess 'Seed',²⁷ and Anat's role is limited to that of mediator between Seth and her father Ra. This seems a comparable role to that which she played in the AB cycle at Ugarit where she appears to be the intermediary between Baal and her father El. However, recent commentators have moved away from the position that this Egyptian myth is based on a Semitic original in favour of the view that it addresses purely Egyptian concerns and that the role played by Anat, although influenced by the Semitic background of her character, is essentially an Egyptian one, as mediator between her lover and her father (Roccati 1972 158; van Dijk 1986 45).

The fact that she is called a 'victorious' goddess and that she is sexually ambiguous, wearing both male and female clothes, seems to be important in this myth. Her epithet, 'victorious', makes a direct allusion to her bellicose character, and in the context of a spell against the poison of a scorpion, probably has a similar effect on the affliction as did the assertion of defeat of the *smn* / 'hw diseases by powerful deities in pLeiden I 345+346. By emphasising the victorious nature of the goddess, the inevitability of defeat for the illness is thereby understood.

Of more interest is the reference to her cross-gender dress. We are told that she wears a skirt like men and a sash like women. The ambiguity of her dress, and hence her sexual status, places her in the medial position between the sexually active and deviant Seth, and the sexually inactive Ra.²⁸ Anat stands somewhere in the middle, as a figure who has associations with both sides. However, it is unlikely that this characteristic was invented by the Egyptians so that she could fulfil this role. It

²⁷The Egyptian *mtwt* can mean both 'seed, semen' and 'poison (of a snake or scorpion)' which fits neatly with the purpose of this text as a spell against the poison of a scorpion (Gardiner 1931; Walls 1992 147).

²⁸If we accept van Dijk's (1986 40) analysis of the text which sees the seed poison given to Osiris in order to copulate and bring about the rebirth of Ra in the morning.

appears from *KTU* 1.19.iv.44f. that Pughat disguises herself as Anat when she wears the clothes appropriate to a warrior (*ḡzr*) and a woman (*att*) and applies rouge. Yatpan appears fooled into thinking that he is entertaining Anat, presumably because of the dress of Pughat, which would indicate that Anat dressed in similar fashion. Thus it seems that Anat's sexual ambiguity was a feature of her character before her introduction into Egypt, and that it was something taken up and used by the Egyptians in their own myths.

2.3.2.11. Other references dated to Ramesses II

There are two other supposed references to the goddess Anat which are dated to the period of Ramesses II. A fragment held at University College London shows a goddess wearing an atef crown with feathers, topped with a small solar disc, and brandishing a weapon (Leclant 1960 13f. and fig. 2). Stadelmann (1967 95) has no hesitation in naming this goddess as Anat, but as Leclant argues, although this goddess appears as a 'Canaanite' goddess, it is impossible to be certain of her identity without actually having the name written. Moreover, the cartouche this goddess protects is the first part of the name of Ramesses, but whether this should be taken as Ramesses II or one of the many later kings with this name is unclear. The second reference is found in the Egyptian version of the treaty between Hattusili and Ramesses II. In the section which gives the divine witnesses to the treaty (*ANET* 201) we find the goddess '*ntrt* of the land of Hatti' (Breasted 1906 III 367-391 #386; Albright 1925 83; Leclant 1960 n.2; Eaton 1964 27; Bowman 1978 246). Albright (1925 83) suggested that the association of Anat and Astarte was so close that this name was formed from a blend of the two names. However, although we find Anat and Astarte paired in some of the texts from the nineteenth dynasty period, there is no

evidence to suggest that the two were yet confused into a single deity.²⁹ A simpler explanation is that there has been a scribal error in which a *n* (water) sign has been written for the orthographically similar *s* (door-bolt) sign (Leclant 1960 6 n.2; Bowman 1978 246). In this case we are left with the more familiar Astarte.

2.3.2.12. Column from Heliopolis

Moving on to the reign of Merenptah, son of Ramesses II, we find a red granite column inscribed with an historical text from Heliopolis (Bakry 1973; Lalouette 1985 271f.) which recounts his victory over the Libyans and Sheklesh in his fifth regnal year. On the first part of the column we see Merenptah standing before Amun who presents the king with a scimitar. On one of the panels of the second part of the broken stele (Bakry 1973 9f.), Anat stands before Merenptah and presents him with a mace-axe whose blade is held away from the king.³⁰ The goddess wears a tight-fitting dress which reaches to her ankles, and on her head is the white crown of Upper Egypt flanked by two feathers, resting on two horizontal horns (the atef crown); she holds the ankh in her left hand and holds up the mace-axe in her right. Her name is given as 'Anat, Mistress of every land'. Before her stands Merenptah wearing the blue crown and offering incense. Above the scene is an inscription in which Anat addresses Merenptah, 'Take for thee thy mace that thou mayest kill thy rebels!' This column shows us that royal patronage of the goddess Anat had not ceased with the death of Ramesses II, and her well known war-like character made her the ideal candidate for supporting the pharaoh in battle. However, there is no

²⁹The Winchester College Stele (see below) may date to the reign of Ramesses III. Although only one goddess is represented, the names of Qedesht, Astarte and Anat, are simply put together in apposition to form the new name, rather than mixing up the three.

³⁰Compare the discussion of Wilkinson (1991) on the orientation of bows in Egyptian and Assyrian iconography. Perhaps the turning of the blade of an axe away from the king is symbolic of the peaceful gesture of the goddess in handing over the weapon.

mention of the mother-son relationship between the two that we found existed between Anat and Ramesses II.

2.3.2.13. Rhind ostrakon

Several references to Anat are dated to the nineteenth dynasty but cannot be fixed with any more accuracy. One of these is the Rhind Ostrakon (Edinburgh 916) which has been dated to the nineteenth dynasty by Dawson and Peet (1933 169). This ostrakon is a fragment out of a longer poem addressed to the Pharaoh and appears to revolve around phonetic and semantic puns (Leclant 1960 6; Eaton 1964 27; Leclant 1975 255; Bowman 1978 235). Lines 12f. read, 'As for the hands of thy Chariot, they are Anat and Astarte'. There does not seem any obvious reason why Anat and Astarte should be considered as the 'hands' (*dt*) of the chariot, except for the fact that they appear as a pair elsewhere in Egypt.³¹ Dawson and Peet (1933 169) write,

There can be no doubt that in the mention of Anath and Astarte we are to see a reference to the Asiatic origin of the chariot.

However, Anat and Astarte are just two deities out of a whole list of Egyptian gods associated with the chariot and it seems unwise to pick out these two because of their Canaanite background and present them as pointers to the Asiatic origin of the chariot. In their translation of the Turin Ostrakon 9588, a text which appears to be a part of the same poem, we find the line, 'The ... of thy chariot are Isis and Nephthys', another pair of goddesses but this time Egyptian in origin. In this light,

³¹See for example the Medinet Habu inscription of Ramesses III, Chester Beatty Papyrus I dating to the 20th dynasty, Harris Magical Papyrus dating to the 19th - 20th dynasty, and the similar iconography shared between these two goddesses (Rowe 1940 31; Leclant 1960). One possible connection of Anat to the chariot was proposed by Løkkegaard (1982 136) who sees in the etymology of the divine name Anat, the Arabic root '*ānah*, 'ass'. His reliance on late first millennium textual evidence to support his case fails to be convincing, although an appeal to the chariot team of Sethos I might have been more appropriate.

the pairing of Anat and Astarte is not extraordinary, and probably has more to do with the image of hands as a pair, rather than indicating the Asiatic origin of chariots.

2.3.2.14. British Museum Stele 646/191

Generally dated to the 19th Dynasty is the stele in the British Museum 646/191 (Budge 1904 I.433 n.1, II.276; Le Lasseur 1919 229-230, 237; Albright 1925 82; Gressmann (ed.) 1926-1927 §270; British Museum 1930 248 pl. XL; Boreux 1939 675-676; Leclant 1960 9; Stadelmann 1967 95; Leclant 1975 254; Fulco 1976 17; Bowman 1978 243; Wyatt 1984 333). This limestone stele, approximately 75cm high, is divided into two sections. In the upper arched section we find the goddess Qedeset³² (*en face*) flanked by Min at her right and Reshef to her left, both facing inwards towards the goddess.³³ Qedeset holds lotus flowers to Min and serpents to Reshef.³⁴ In the lower register we find the goddess Anat seated on a low backed chair, facing left towards three worshippers. In typically Egyptian fashion, she is shown with torso *en face*, but legs, bare feet and head in profile. She wears the white crown with the plumes of Maat, and appears to be dressed in a long garment with straps over her shoulders; in her right hand are a shield and a spear held vertically, and in her left hand she holds horizontally at head height a battle-axe so

³²Although the goddess here is given the name of Kent, she is depicted in an identical form to that of Qedeset and should not be distinguished from her (Leibovitch 1961). For further discussion of the Qedeset stelae see Boreux (1939) and Leibovitch (1961).

³³The identity of *qds* has long been a matter of debate. The lexeme has variously been identified as an epithet of Anat (Dussaud 1931 367f.; Gaster 1946-47 289), or of both Anat and Astarte (Stadelmann 1967; Lipiński 1986 90), or as the third 'Great Goddess', i.e. Athirat/Asherah (Albright 1954a; Cross 1973 33; Hestrin 1987 218; but cp. Wiggins 1991). The stone bowl of Redford, and the Winchester College Relief seem to affirm the identity of a goddess distinct from either Anat or Astarte (Clamer 1980 160), but on the equation *qds* = '*trt*', there is little agreement. It seems safest to assume that *qds* is the personal name of a goddess in her own right.

³⁴Hestrin (1987 218) notes that with only one exception, when Qedeset is flanked by Min and Reshef she holds lotus flowers to Min and snakes to Reshef.

that it passes behind her crown.³⁵ Above the goddess an inscription calls her 'Anat, Mistress of Heaven, Mistress of all the gods' and behind her stands the phrase, 'All protection, Life, Longevity and Luck follow her' (Stadelmann 1967 95). Clamer's (1980 169) assertion that this stele reveals a coalescence of Qedeset and Anat in their roles as fertility goddesses seems to fly in the face of the iconography which portrays Anat in a very aggressive light, and it seems better to hold these two goddesses apart rather than confuse them. The two statues of the goddess from Tanis portray Anat without any weapons, and the relief on the column from Heliopolis does not represent the goddess as an aggressive deity: she simply hands over a weapon to the king. Here, the goddess appears to be brandishing her weapons, with the mace-axe raised in preparation to strike,³⁶ with much the same posture as the standing armed figurines (Negbi 1976; Seeden 1980).

2.3.2.15. Michaélidis ostrakon

The final piece of evidence which is dated to the nineteenth dynasty is a hieratic ostrakon in the Michaélidis collection (Grdseloff 1942 35-39 pls. VII-VIII; Eaton 1964 28; Leclant 1975 256 n.19; Bowman 1978 235; Wente 1990 127). One side shows two portraits: on the right the head of a Ramesside king wearing a war helmet, and on the left a king wearing a skull cap, similar to that worn by Sethos II (Budge 1914 pl. XLI), which leads Grdseloff (1942 36) to think that this is very probably a portrayal of Sethos II, although the connection is very tenuous. On the other side we find text in the form of a letter, the first part of which sends greetings

³⁵Compare Wilkinson's (1991) remarks on the way bows are portrayed on the pharaohs.

³⁶Compare the fragment discussed above showing a Canaanite goddess protecting the cartouche of a Ramesside king, and the several other images of a goddess with weapon raised ready to strike (Leclant 1960 fig.2, pl.II, fig.7 [Reshef], fig.10, etc.).

from the scribe *Ipwy* stationed in the garrison at Gaza to his superior *Bekanamoun*. The second part of the letter reads as follows (Wente 1990),

A further communication to my [lord: The offerings that you sent for] the festival of Anath of Gaza have all [arrived], and I received your(?) [...] for the goddess. A scout [...] the ship [captain] Kar [...]. See, the [Remainder lost]

This text gives us a clear indication for a cult of Anat in the far south of Palestine at the end of the thirteenth century, as well as the fact that she enjoyed a festival of some kind, although the details of this are lost. However, it does appear that provisions of some description were dispatched from Egypt for the express purpose of being used in this Anat festival. Whether this cult of Anat was of local origin and adopted by the Egyptian garrison because of the popularity of the goddess in 19th dynasty royal circles, or whether the cult was taken with the garrison from Egypt to Gaza is impossible to establish from this piece of evidence.

2.3.3. Twentieth Dynasty

2.3.3.1. Medinet Habu

Moving now from the nineteenth into the twentieth dynasty, we find a couple of references to Anat dated to the reign of Ramesses III, and one further possibility dating to this period. On the Medinet Habu Temple we find the following inscription concerning Ramesses III (Breasted 1906 IV.62; Albright 1925 83; Edgerton and Wilson 1936 75; Leclant 1960 6; Eaton 1964 26; Stadelmann 1967 95; Bowman 1978 235),

Montu and Seth are with [him in] every fray, Anath and Astarte are his shield. Amon judges his speech, he turns not himself back, bearing the sword of Egypt over the Asiatics.

Here we find once again the pairing of Anat and Astarte as we found in the poem of the chariot (Rhind ostrakon). In the Rhind ostrakon the pairing of these

two goddesses was used to convey the dual nature of the piece of equipment on the chariot to which they were compared, the 'hands' of the chariot. This text deals with the king in battle: Montu and Seth are with him, Anat and Astarte are his shield. We are probably not dealing primarily with a piece of physical equipment as in the chariot example, or that of the sword of Ramesses II, but rather the shield is a metaphor for the divine protection extended to him by Anat and Astarte. The close association of Montu and Seth has already been seen in the Tanis obelisks (see above) and the close association of Seth and Anat³⁷ is a natural introduction to the divine pair Anat-Astarte as a balance to the first pair. There are certain similarities with the scene in the Ugaritic text *KTU* 1.2.i.40, in which the pair Anat-Astarte take hold of the hands of Baal in order to restrain him from attacking the messengers of Yam. Here, the goddesses protect Baal from the consequences of his own actions; if he were to attack the messengers of Yam, his unjust behaviour would expose him to a just defeat at the hands of Yam. The divine pair shield Baal from the aggression of Yam, and in a similar way, at Medinet Habu, the goddesses shield the Pharaoh from the dangers of war.

2.3.3.2. Stele from Beth Shan

From the Northern Temple of Ramesses III at Beth-Shan comes the upper part of a private Egyptian stele dedicated by a man apparently named Hesi-Nakht, or perhaps 'The Singer, Nakht' (Rowe 1930 32 and pl. L, 1940 pl. LXV; Leclant 1960 9; Eaton 1964 30; Stadelmann 1967 96; Oldenburg 1969 84, Leclant 1975 254; Wyatt 1984 331). On the left is the figure of Anat who bears the titles, 'Anat, the Queen of Heaven, Mistress of all the gods'. The base of the stele is missing and the feet of the figures are lost. The goddess appears to be dressed in a tight fitting robe, and in

³⁷See, for example, pBeatty VII and the northern obelisk from Tanis.

typical Egyptian style, her torso is *en face* whilst her legs and head are in profile. In her left hand she holds a *was* sceptre, and in her right hand is the ankh. On her head she wears the atef crown composed of the white crown flanked by feathers. Opposite her stands the figure of the votary, with hands raised in adoration to the goddess. Between the two figures is an offering-stand with a libation pot and a lotus on it. A text which runs above the scene reads, 'An-offering-which-the-king-gives to Anat, that she may give all life, prosperity and health to the double [of] Hesi-Nakht? (or The Singer, Nakht)'. Rowe (1940 33 n.50) observes that Anat is usually shown seated on a throne, holding a battle-axe in one hand and a spear and shield in the other. Since in the present stele she is not armed, he concludes that Anat is in fact dressed as Astarte, and as such is to be identified with her. However, this merging of the identities of Anat and Astarte cannot be supported. We have seen, from the evidence discussed so far, that Anat portrayed as an armed goddess is by no means her dominant iconography, and this stele cannot be accepted as evidence for the merging of Anat and Astarte into a composite deity.

Compare the almost identical figure on a stele from the temple of Amenophis III at Beth Shan (Rowe 1930 pl.48.2; *ANEP* 475; Vincent 1937 646 n.1; Rowe 1940 8, 81, pl. 35, 5 and 49A, 1; Leclant 1960 9; Eaton 1964 112; Wyatt 1984 331). Here the goddess wears the atef crown with single ribbon at the back, and is dressed in very similar fashion as the Anat stele from the Ramesses III temple. In her right hand she holds the ankh, and in her left a sceptre with the head of a lotus (?). For some reason unknown to us, the stele was left unfinished; before the headdress of the goddess remains a panel probably intended to take the name of the goddess, but which was left blank. The usual position is that this goddess represents Astarte (Rowe 1930, 1940, Leclant 1960, etc.), although this is based solely on the fact that she bears no weapons, and is debatable in light of the Anat stele with its very similar iconography. The fact that an Egyptian official stationed at Beth Shan should erect a

stele to Anat shows us that during the New Kingdom period at least, when in foreign lands, Egyptians could turn to foreign gods in whose sphere they found themselves in order to receive blessings. This situation is similar to that which we found in the Michaélidis ostrakon where Egyptians honoured Anat.

2.3.3.3. Winchester College relief

Tentatively dated to the reign of Ramesses III is the painted limestone relief of Winchester College published by Edwards (1955), and which unfortunately is now missing (Wiggins 1991 387 n.40). It shows a naked goddess *en face* standing on a lion,³⁸ who is called in the accompanying inscription, 'Qedeshet-Astarte-Anat'. She holds a lotus flower in her right hand and a serpent in her left and has the Hathor hair style, as in other Qedeshet stelae. A further inscription indicates that the relief was 'Made for the necropolis official Neferhotep, justified' (Edwards 1955 51). If, as seems the case, this stele was originally the property of a Semitic worker at Thebes, then we are dealing with an object of private dedication which lies outside the realm of the royal cult. From what we have seen so far, there is no evidence to suggest that the royal cult of Anat confused her with any other goddess, although she is sometimes paired with Astarte. However, such pairing should not be confused with syncretism. As we saw above, this triad of Semitic goddesses is identical to that found on the stone bowl described by Redford. On the stone bowl, the names of the goddesses appear to refer to three distinct deities, and Clamer's (1980 159) assertion that on the Winchester relief we find a fusion of the three main goddesses into one "triune divinity" remains unconvincing in the light of all the other evidence we have for the goddess Anat. I would prefer to see this as one image that could represent equally three distinct goddesses, whose names we find written alongside the image. Like the

³⁸See Edwards (1955 49) for further examples of this iconographic motif and bibliography.

stone bowl, this relief has no authenticated provenance and any appeal to this piece as evidence for the syncretism of Semitic goddesses in Egypt should be treated with much caution.³⁹

2.3.3.4. Later Ramesside References

The further away in time we get from the height of Anat's popularity under Ramesses II, the less frequently we find her mentioned. From the time of Ramesses IV we find her name on an ostracon (Leclant 1975 254), and from the time of Ramesses V we find Anat as the divine element in the theophoric personal name *'nt-ḥ'ty* 'Anat has appeared' (from *ḥ'i* 'rise, appear'; Faulkner 1972 185) in the Papyrus Wilbour A, column 65, line 27 (Ranke 1935-52 II.272 #11; Gardiner (ed.) 1941-52; Leclant 1975 256 n.17; Bowman 1978 224). In the Book of the Dead (BM 11466), dated to the New Kingdom, we find the feminine personal name *'a-n-tá-ra-m*, 'Anat is high, exulted' (Ranke 1935-52 II.272 #9; Helck 1971 362; Bowman 1978 224).

2.3.4. References dated to the Ramesside era

2.3.4.1. Papyrus Chester Beatty I

The goddess Anat appears in other contexts which cannot be dated to any particular reign, but can be assigned roughly to the Ramesside era. In pBeatty I, dated to the 20th Dynasty (Gardiner 1931; Leclant 1960 7; 1975 255; te Velde 1977 113; Bowman 1978 236) the goddess Neith gives instructions that the Ennead: in order to settle the dispute of inheritance between Horus and Seth, she suggests that Horus is given his rightful inheritance of the office of his father, and that Seth should be

³⁹Cf. the comments of Wiggins (1991) on the attempts to identify Qedeshet with Asherah.

recompensed by being given Anat and Astarte, daughters of Ra. Once again we find the goddesses Anat and Astarte paired, as in the Rhind ostrakon and the inscription from Medinet Habu discussed above. We also find that in this text, Anat and Astarte are described as daughters of Ra. Compare this genealogy to that found on the stone bowl of Redford where Anat is the daughter of Ptah.

Te Velde (1977 112) notes the surprising nature of Anat and Astarte being given to Seth, considering the usual low regard in which foreigners, and sexual relations with foreigners in particular, were held. However, perhaps in the background of this link between Seth and the two Canaanite goddesses is the assumption that Seth was the lord of foreign lands. We should not forget that Egyptian kings took foreign wives into their harems, a famous example being Ramesses II's acceptance of the daughter of the Hittite king Hattusili III (Kitchen 1982 83f.). Thus in Neith's decision, Horus is to receive what is rightfully his, that is full control over the civilised world of Egypt, and Seth is to receive what is seen to be his prerogative as lord of the other lands, that is the 'foreign' goddesses. Te Velde (1977 30) suggests that Anat and Astarte are not actually given to Seth, but that Seth remains outside the normal marital order (Walls 1992 145); however, we are not told that the Ennead ignored Neith's suggestion but simply that some time later Horus and Seth were still in dispute, and the pairing of Anat and Seth in martial contexts does suggest that some kind of relationship was supposed between them.

This myth of the contendings of Horus and Seth appears to address an indigenous Egyptian problem concerning the relationship between these two feuding gods, and the reality that results in the abrasive interaction of order and chaos, rather than an Egyptian rendering of some unknown Canaanite myth. Anat and Astarte appear to be incidental to this plot, and may have only been included because of their 'foreign-ness'.

2.3.4.2. Harris Magical Papyrus

Another Ramesside reference to the goddess Anat comes in the Harris Magical Papyrus (III 5-10, = Papyrus British Museum 10042). In an incantation against crocodiles we read (Albright 1925 83; Blok 1930 185; Leclant 1960 6; Stadelmann 1967 95; Leclant 1975 255; Bowman 1978 241; Walls 1992 149),

Close your mouth! Shut your mouth!⁴⁰ As the window in Mendes was closed when the Earth appeared in Abydos, as the mouth of the womb of Anat and Astarte was closed, the two great goddesses, who became pregnant, but did not give birth. They were closed through Horus and opened by Seth.⁴¹

Walls (1992 149f.) has rightly pointed out that this apparent fragment of some otherwise unknown myth involving the two divine pairs Anat-Astarte, and Horus-Seth, has to be understood within its present context of an incantation against the crocodile. Note that once again we find the divine pair Anat-Astarte. First comes the command to the crocodile, 'Shut your mouth!', followed by two mythic precedents which are intended to make the incantation effective. The first is a cosmogonic allusion, and just as the second precedent has a Semitic colouring, so

⁴⁰Addressed to the crocodile.

⁴¹Walls (1992 150) mentions a personal communication of Prof. B. Bryan who suggests reading 'shrine' rather than 'window', and that *hm.t* 'womb', may in fact be a misreading for *dm.t* 'knife'. Without a personal inspection of the original papyrus, it is impossible to verify these suggestions, although Walls' alternative translation, 'as one closes the mouth for the knife of Anat and Astarte' seems less convincing than the translation given. As for the first emendation of 'window' to 'shrine', again it is impossible to verify this. However, if we retain the word 'window', this allows us to compare such texts as Gen. 7:11, אֲרָבֹת הַשָּׁמַיִם 'windows of heaven' which were opened when the earth disappeared under the cosmic waters (cf. 2 Kgs. 7.2), and KTU 1.4.v where there is some disagreement over a window (*urbt*) in Baal's new palace/temple, perhaps with the threat of invasion by Yam who possibly represents the cosmic waters (CML2 62 n.4). However, we should also express caution in using such parallel material. The Ugaritic/Israelite myth may have its basis in the observed fact of floods caused by high rain fall, whereas the flooding of the Nile and its subsequent retreat to reveal the land is an annual, beneficial event.

here we find the Semitic notion of windows in heaven through which the cosmic waters fall.

The second mythic precedent is the fact that the mouth of the womb of Anat and Astarte was closed. Many have interpreted this passage to mean that Horus prevented the pregnant goddesses from giving birth, whilst Seth opened their wombs and enabled them to give birth (e.g., Albright 1968 129). This understands the dichotomy of closed/opened as that of unable to give birth/able to give birth. However, as te Velde (1977) has demonstrated, the sexuality of Seth in Egyptian myth deviates from the norm, and to suppose that Horus prevents birth whilst Seth enables birth reverses the normal roles of these gods. A fresh understanding of this text by te Velde (1977 28f.; following A. Barb) sees the exact opposite in the duality of open/closed. In this view, a closed womb is one that has ceased menstruation and therefore refers to pregnancy, whilst opening the womb during pregnancy begins the menstrual cycle and induces an abortion. Now we see the roles of Horus and Seth in their usual capacities of 'normal' and 'abnormal', i.e., Horus impregnates but Seth causes an abortion. This seems to make sense of the fact that the goddesses are called 'the great goddesses who became pregnant but did not give birth', i.e., who aborted because of Seth rather than attaining normal delivery, rather than seeing Anat and Astarte as goddesses who became pregnant but who *could* not give birth, i.e., who could not deliver their babies.

Walls (1992 151) raises the possibility that the phrase 'mouth of the womb' could refer to the vagina, and that this is a reference to their virginity, but then dismisses it because of the statement that the goddesses were pregnant, which would presuppose sexual intercourse. Possibly, the phrase 'mouth of the womb' was used simply because the incantation is intended to shut the mouth of the crocodile, and probably signifies nothing more than 'womb'; the heightened similarity between the

object of the incantation and the mythic precedent strengthening the incantation's magical power.

More interestingly, Walls stresses that within the context of this incantation, it is the normality of the 'closed' status of the two precedents that has efficacy over the open/closed status of the crocodile's mouth. If we read 'windows' rather than 'shrines' for the first precedent, then we can see perfectly well that 'normal' status for the cosmic windows is 'closed', because when opened, they allow chaos, disorder and destruction into the world.⁴² Using the same logic, we find that the 'normal' status for the wombs of Anat and Astarte must also be 'closed', which would seem to suggest that the 'normal' status of these two goddesses was that they were pregnant. If this does not seem surprising in a pantheon where many goddesses (and gods!) give birth, we must ask why these two goddesses were singled out in particular. Perhaps it is because of the duality of the incantation, the opposition of open/closed which demanded a pair of goddesses rather than any single goddess, although the duality is actually reflected in the status of the womb rather than in the number of goddesses. Perhaps it was because these two goddesses were renowned in some myth, now lost to us, for having been 'opened' by Seth and therefore caused to abort their pregnancies, as part of the ongoing struggle between Horus and Seth. 'Opening' the womb allows chaos to enter the normal world of pregnancy, and the disastrous consequence is an abnormal birth, at the wrong time, and bringing death not new life into the world. Just as the opening of the cosmic windows, and of the wombs of the goddesses, brings chaos and disorder into being, so we are to believe that the opening of the crocodile's mouth constitutes a grave threat to an ancient Egyptian. By drawing on the normality of 'closed' from the two precedents, the

⁴²The normality of shrines being 'closed' is harder to understand in this context.

incantation hopes to induce 'closed' status on the potentially dangerous mouth of the crocodile.

2.3.4.3. Papyrus Leiden I 343 + 345 (Ramesside)

Although these two manuscripts lack an assured provenance, vocabulary and orthography indicate a Memphite origin dating to the Ramesside era (Massart 1954 1). Together, they constitute a collection of spells directed mainly against the diseases called *smn* and *'hw* whose natures are little understood, and are characterised by the magician either assimilating himself to various gods, including Semitic ones such as Baal, Reshef, Anat, Astarte, Qedeshet, or Nin-gal in his battle against these illnesses, or asserting the defeat of these diseases at the hands of various gods as a *fait accompli* (Leclant 1975 255).

Massart (1954 50f.) finds a possible occurrence of Anat in Recto I.4f. and Verso III.1f. although the whole of her name does not occur. At the beginning of verso III.7 we find *'n[]* which is taken to be the name of the goddess, following which there is a reference to 'the mistress of the chisels', which is reminiscent of the text we find in pBeatty VII (Stadelmann 1967 95), although the chisel in that myth is not connected with Anat but is a description of the intercourse of the God Above and the seed (van Dijk 1986 50 n.70). If it is Anat who is the mistress of the chisel in this text, then she appears in the context of Seth, Baal and Horus smashing their various weapons into the head of the *smn* and its accomplices. In other words, it is the aggressive warrior aspect of the goddess that is in the forefront of this spell.

A second spell (Recto III.2f. and Verso V.8f.) involves Anat in a myth to which there is no known parallel, and which involves Ra slitting the throat of wild asses and Anat collecting his own spilled blood in jars. Massart translates the more complete text (Recto III.7-IV.4) as follows,

Thou [the diseases *ḥw* and *smn*] belongest to the wild asses which are <in> the desert. *Prē*‘, he turneth his back to the desert and leaneth on the hill of *Ḥmrk*. After he hath seized (the asses) with his left hand, he cutteth (their throats) with his right; his blood falleth upon his foot, it falleth at the door of the earth and the earth feareth saying: Come to me! Come to me! Who teacheth a man (??) ... Anat of *’Iddkn*; she bringeth seven jugs of silver and eight jugs of bronze and she poureth the blood upon the ground and she causeth the *kḥb* of *Prē*‘ which are more bitter than the *ḥmy*-plants to present (?) it to *Prē*‘. They strike upon the nose of the *ḥw*, they strike at his comrades.

Massart (1954 62) draws a comparison between this text and *KTU* 1.6.i in which Anat and Shapshu are involved in the mourning rites for Baal, although his comment that Anat is a ‘Goddess of Blood’, drawing on *KTU* 1.3.ii, should perhaps be rephrased to read that Anat is a goddess who revels in battle. In this Egyptian myth, Anat appears to aid Ra by scooping up the blood he lost. However, her following action of pouring out the blood upon the ground seems to defeat her purpose⁴³ unless we accept that her actions may follow the usual pattern of making offerings to the gods by pouring liquids from jars, and that by doing this, she is restoring Ra’s blood back to himself.⁴⁴

Massart suggests that Anat’s inclusion in this myth is because of her role in the Semitic myth *KTU* 1.3.ii where she wades through blood. However, we could ask why Anat fulfils this role rather than the Egyptian goddess Hathor-Sekhmet, who was equally as bloodthirsty as Anat in her slaughter of humans (*ANET* 10f.). However, it is not the connection with blood that is the most prominent feature of this myth, but Anat’s concern for the well being of Ra. Such concern demonstrated by Anat is graphically described in the Ugaritic myth *KTU* 1.6.i and ii where we read of her search for the body of Baal, and her numerous offerings at the burial of Baal

⁴³Massart (1954 62 n.28) admits that “If it is to ‘pour the blood on the ground’ on which it was already falling, one does not see why Anat brought fifteen jugs as if, on the contrary, to collect it and so prevent it from falling”.

⁴⁴Dr N. Wyatt has suggested to me orally that perhaps we should emend the text to read ‘their blood’, and thereby alleviate the obvious difficulties with this text.

(KTU 1.6.i.18f.). It would not be surprising if this Semitic myth were known to the Egyptians, as we can imagine that the introduction of a foreign deity must have included the main myths connected with the deity as part of the elaboration of his or her role and character. However, I am not suggesting that this Egyptian myth is based on or is a translation of a Semitic myth, but that Anat's character as known from Semitic myth as a goddess who revels in blood but who can also show great concern for others made her inclusion in this myth very appropriate.

The mention of a 'chisel' of Anat is also found in a spell in Verso IV.9f., where we read, "the chisel of Anat is stuck in thy temple", addressed to the disease 'hw (Massart 1954 105). Here, the word translated 'chisel' *Ḥḏ3t* indicates a lighter sculptor's chisel, rather than the heavier *bḥ3* found in verso III.7, 'the mistress of the chisels'. However, Anat⁴⁵ participates in this myth as an aggressive warrior goddess, and the magician simply asserts that the 'hw disease has already been defeated through her actions.

A further spell (Massart 1954 70f.) makes an interesting allusion to a mother-son relationship between the goddess and the magician which recalls that between Ramesses II and Anat. Here we read,

Behold, I have sucked at the breasts of Anat, the great cow (?) of Seth.
Behold, I have many matters against thee. I drank it in the great jug of
Seth, I drained it in his *nm*-jug.

Massart (73 n.16) sees the middle sentence as a parenthesis or out of place, and believes that the last sentence should continue from the first. However, Wyatt (*oral comm.*) suggests that we understand this spell as verse with a chiasmic structure. Whatever line we take, it appears that sucking from the breasts of Anat

⁴⁵In verso IV.9 we can be certain that Anat is the goddess wielding the 'chisel' and smashing it into the skull of the 'hw disease, whereas in verso III.7, the divine name 'Anat' has been restored from the two letters 'n[] and which therefore is uncertain.

parallels drinking her milk from Seth's great jug.⁴⁶ The first image is thoroughly Egyptian in its conception, and we can compare references which portray the king as sucking from a divine mother goddess (see below). The second part seems to imply that Seth milks Anat and stores her milk in jars; i.e., Anat is thought of in bovine form. The magician's claim to have sucked milk from the breasts of Anat is obviously intended to assert his invincibility against the disease he fights. However, it also has interesting implications for the debate over the Egyptian epithet *mhr 'nt* applied to Ramesses II, which I discuss below. Suffice it to say that if a magician can claim to be the nursling of Anat in such explicit terms, it would seem only natural that the king would see himself in comparable terms.

One final point of interest is the pairing of Anat and Astarte in Recto XVIII (Massart 1954 85.g) in which these two goddesses appear to be involved in the drawing out of blood and poison from the person inflicted with disease. Although this fragment is a further example of such a pairing of these two goddesses in Egyptian myth, it is unfortunately too fragmentary to deduce much else beyond that.

2.4. FIRST MILLENNIUM REFERENCES

Although strictly speaking outside the scope of the present work, which concentrates on Anat in the second millennium B.C., it is instructive to examine the Egyptian references to Anat in the first millennium B.C. in order to understand better the link between her cult in the New Kingdom period, and her possible presence at Elephantine which I examined in chapter one.

⁴⁶Compare the mighty jug (variously labelled *bk rb* || *dn* || *ks.qdš* || *krpn*) from which Baal drinks his wine in *KTU* 1.3.i.

Once we leave the Ramesside period behind us, references to Anat become few and far between. However, one piece, dated to the second half of the seventh century, is a bronze situla of unknown provenance, 11cm high and 3.8cm diameter at the rim (Grdseloff 1942 28-35; Eaton 1964, 105; Stadelmann 1967 96; Leclant 1975 257 n.37; Bowman 1978 248). The situla bears a frieze, the main scene of which portrays the adoration by a male figure with raised arms, standing in front of an offering table, of an enthroned deity (Grdseloff 1942, pl. VI). An inscription above the worshipper identifies him as Psamtik⁴⁷ whilst a separate inscription over the goddess identifies her as 'Anat, mistress of Heaven'. The goddess is seated on a square throne with a short back. She wears the white crown with two feathers (the hornless atef crown); in her right hand she holds a spear and shield, whilst her left raises a mace or an axe which passes horizontally behind her crown. It seems that she wears a dress which covers her from her chest to her feet, with two straps over her shoulders, and perhaps a necklace of some kind. The similarity of this scene with that on the British Museum stele described above, as well as the wording of the inscription, prompts Grdseloff (1942, 31) to comment that the situla seems to be a copy of the stele. However, the existence of a further relief with identical iconography (Cassuto 1971 frontispiece) raises the possibility that we are dealing with an iconographic motif involved with Anat.

Moving on from the seventh century, we find a passing reference to Anat from the middle of the fourth century on an altar of Nektanebo II,⁴⁸ third king of 30th Dynasty (Leclant 1975 255). Of greater interest, however, is the Graeco-Roman

⁴⁷Later to become king Psamtik I according to Grdseloff. Leclant (1975) raises a doubt about this piece, but does not elucidate further.

⁴⁸Museum of Turin no. 1751.

funerary stele⁴⁹ which portrays the priest Petimuthes before three deities, each with an identifying inscription: 'Anat, Lady of the House of Anat', 'Mut, the Great One, Lady of the House of Anat', and 'Khonsu, the Child, Lord of the House of Anat' (von Bissing 1911-14 #120a; Blok 1930 182; Grdseloff 1942 24; Eaton 1964 31; Leclant 1975 255; Bowman 1978 239f.). Anat is seated on a low-backed throne and appears very similar to Mut who sits in front of her.⁵⁰ Both wear a tight fitting gown which goes from their ankles to under their breasts, which are exposed and clearly depicted. Anat wears a collar around her neck and bands on her wrist and upper arm. In her left hand is the papyrus sceptre, also held by Mut, and her right hand appears to be empty, whilst the right hands of both Mut and Khonsu grasp an ankh. Despite the obvious similarities between these two goddesses, we are also aware of the differences between them, the most prominent of which is their differing headdress. Mut wears a long wig, on which is the vulture cap and the double crown, whilst Anat, who has no visible hair, wears a reed-bundle atef crown, a feather at each side, and topped by a sun-disc; in fact it looks remarkably similar to that which she invariably wore in second millennium portrayals (Grdseloff 1942 24). Blok (1930 183) comments that from this stele we can see that Anat is no longer venerated as a warrior goddess, presumably because she lacks weapons, but as Bowman (1978 239) correctly points out, we have several Ramesside depictions of Anat in which she bears no weapons, although we know from texts that she was indeed worshipped as a goddess of war in this period.

The name Anat has also been noted on a plaquette along with the name of Ptolemy VI (Cairo Museum J.E. 85625; Leclant 1975 255), and she may be the

⁴⁹L. Scheurleer Museum S.633.

⁵⁰Lesko (1991 4) notes that in Egyptian perspective, figures seated behind one another on stelae are intended to be seated side by side, as we see in the plastic arts.

goddess who receives the gift of two mirrors from Augustus at Philae, although here, the goddess has the form of Isis (Leclant 1975 255; Bowman 1978 248).

2.5. THE ICONOGRAPHY OF ANAT

2.5.1. Identified Iconography

Having discussed the references to Anat in Egypt, we have also covered every iconographic representation of the goddess of which we can be certain. It thus seems appropriate to examine the iconography of Anat at this point, beginning with those Egyptian pieces and then turning to other pieces which are claimed to represent Anat but which lack identifying inscriptions.

If we were to judge solely from the scholarly literature, representations of the goddess Anat would appear to be fairly numerous; however, the number dwindles to a mere handful once we realise that we can only positively identify the goddess Anat on monuments which have an accompanying inscription which identifies her. Until now we have limited ourselves to references which we can be certain refer to Anat; thus for pieces which physically portray the goddess, as opposed to purely textual references, we can be certain that what we see is the goddess Anat, and this opens the way to establishing whether there is any consistent pattern in her iconography. We are then in a position to examine those pieces which it has been claimed depict Anat, but which are in fact 'anonymous'. By examining the identified representations, it is tempting to isolate those attributes that we find are applied exclusively to her. Once these are isolated, we may proceed to identify anonymous female representations as Anat if they also are shown with these specific attributes. However, we are faced with a problem with this method in that it ignores the fact that

each culture tends to use different techniques and styles in its visual arts; indeed, such differences form the basis for the comparative study of the art of the ancient Near East. Instead of having a broad spectrum of images from a wide geographical area that are identified as Anat, all our evidence has an Egyptian provenance or is executed in the Egyptian style. We must therefore be aware that if we isolate any distinctive attributes of Anat from this evidence, we may only be isolating specifically *Egyptian* characteristics that were given to the goddess. This would then have the unfortunate effect of excluding any 'anonymous' representations of Anat that are not executed in Egyptian style.

In all representations Anat is shown wearing a tight-fitting dress which falls to her ankles, and in some cases is held in by means of a belt at the waist. In some cases her breasts appear to be exposed (the stele in Lunsingh Scheurleer Museum is a clear example), but on others we cannot be sure this was the case. What does appear to be certain is that Anat was never depicted completely naked, unlike the Qedesht representations. The only possible exception is the Winchester College relief, although this is rather anomalous since it represents not Anat, but three goddesses, and belongs to the Qedesht style. As for jewellery, she often wears a collar and sometimes wears bands around her upper arms and wrists. There appears to be nothing extraordinary in the clothing she wears, which can be found on many depictions of goddesses and women, and the fact that she appears portrayed slim and youthful is not significant since statuary of women in the New Kingdom were normally portrayed in this way (Lesko 1991 7).

Formal distinctions between humans and gods are seen in the fact that gods (including the Pharaoh) wear complex crowns, whilst humans do not. Distinctions are also made between the gods in anthropomorphic form by depicting them with specific crowns which identify the gods for who they are. As for Anat,

although there appears to be some consistency in what is shown on her head, there are differences, and the following table presents the data for comparison.

	Crown	Feathers of Maat	Ram's Horns
Ramesses II and Anat (Seated)	White Crown	Yes	Yes
Ramesses II and Anat (Standing)	?	?	?
Brooklyn Museum 54.67	White Crown	Yes	No
Column from Heliopolis	White Crown	Yes	Yes
British Museum stele 646	White Crown	Yes	No
Stele from Beth Shan	White Crown	Yes	No
Bronze Situla of seventh Century	White Crown	Yes	No ⁵¹
Scheurleer Museum stele	Reed Crown ⁵² with solar disc	Yes	No

From the above table, we can see that Anat's usual headdress is the White Crown of upper Egypt with plumes of Maat, and sometimes with ram's horns. In other words, she invariably wears variations on the atef crown (Abubakr 1937).

Her hands can be empty (two statue groups from Tanis), or she can hold a *was* sceptre and an ankh, either of which are often seen in the hands of many other deities portrayed in Egypt and are certainly not specific to Anat. We appear to have two types of representation emerging from our material: representations from Tanis portray Anat in a thoroughly Egyptian style wearing the atef crown but with no outstanding features, whilst representations from elsewhere may depict her heavily armed. One of these latter types may be understood to be a product of its context: the column from Heliopolis portrays Anat as one among several deities to proffer weapons to the king. She holds a mace-axe to the king, whilst Amun holds out a

⁵¹The hand drawing of Grdseloff (1942) appears to show a white crown resting on ram's horns, but close inspection of the photograph confirms the absence of ram's horns.

⁵²A variant of the white crown variety (Abubakr 1937 7).

scimitar and addresses the king, 'Take for thee the scimitar against every foreign land!' (Bakry 1973 7). This column has a text relating the victory of Merenptah over the Libyans and Sheklesh which contextualises the action of the divine bestowing of weapons.

Two other representations of Anat portray her bearing weapons but without any overtly military context in which to understand this motif (BM stele 646 and the Bronze Situla from 7th century). In both she sits on an Egyptian square low-backed throne facing an offering table, in her right hand she holds a shield and spear, and in her left hand she raises up a mace-axe so that it passes horizontally behind her crown (not in perspective). In fact, these two representations are almost identical in the way they present Anat as an aggressive goddess, and this has led Grdseloff (1942 31) to suggest that the artist of the vase borrowed the image from the stele. It is of course extremely difficult to prove such a statement, and we cannot rule out the possibility of a iconographic tradition which portrayed Anat in this bellicose way, especially when we take into consideration the Michaélidis relief which introduces a third image of a goddess in exactly this same pose. However, since there is approximately half a millennium between the stele and the situla,⁵³ and we find so few pieces of this nature, I would hesitate to suggest an iconographic 'tradition', and rather believe that copying of the earlier monument is a real possibility. If we ask the question, why did the artist of the Psamtik situla copy the portrayal of Anat from a 19th dynasty stele, perhaps the answer lies in the political situation of Psamtik. Did romantic notions of Egypt's previous grandeur under the 19th dynasty, and the fact that Psamtik is credited with the freeing of Egypt from Assyrian domination and beginning the 26th dynasty (Gardiner 1961 352f.), identify this leader with the

⁵³We can only make an estimate based on the supposed dating for each piece, since neither has an archaeological context.

greatest king of the 19th dynasty? In this case, perhaps Psamtik venerated the goddess so beloved of Ramesses II, in her guise as a goddess of war, as an emulation of this great Pharaoh.

From the discussion so far we have seen that Anat is usually portrayed wearing a tight-fitting dress, with accompanying jewellery around her neck and on her arms. This is true both for when she is armed and unarmed. In some representations she is shown armed with a shield, spear and mace-axe, whilst on the Heliopolis column she holds just the mace-axe, and at other times she is unarmed, either holding a sceptre or staff and ankh, or nothing at all. She always wears the white crown with plumes, sometimes with ram's horns, and only once in a very late stele does she wear the variant reed bundle crown surmounted by a solar disc.

It is interesting to note that the representations of Anat and Ramesses II always show the goddess unarmed and in a tender pose with the Pharaoh, with her hand resting protectively on his shoulder, or holding his hand in her own. This may be the physical representation of the mother-son relationship we found to be so strong between this particular Pharaoh and Anat. The contemporary British Museum stele 646 is a private stele and there Anat is depicted as a bellicose goddess, with no suggestion of a mother-son relationship between Anat and the votary. The imagery is more suggestive of the picture of Anat in pLeiden, for example, where the bellicose nature of the goddess is at the fore because of her ability to defeat illness and hence protect the individual. The Heliopolis column shows that even by the time of Merenptah, son of Ramesses II, the close mother-son relationship between the king and goddess is rather less important than the bellicose nature of the goddess who gives her protection to the king in battle.

If we were now presented with a representation of a goddess which did not have any identifying inscription, would we be in any position to determine

whether it was intended to portray Anat? There can never be any absolute certainties when dealing with anonymous representations; what we must work with are degrees of probability. We might assert that some representations have a high probability of being a portrayal of Anat, whilst others are less likely. The great majority of representations that are claimed to be of Anat will have to be classified as possibilities but unable to be proved, especially when it comes to those whose style is other than Egyptian, and for which we have no reliable guide.

2.5.2. Anonymous Iconography

2.5.2.1. Relief from the Michaélidis Collection

I shall begin this survey of material with the relief from the Michaélidis collection, best known as the frontispiece to Cassuto's *Hā-'Ēlā 'Ānāth*⁵⁴ (Eaton 1964 105; Cassuto 1971; Wyatt 1984). This relief appears to be the mirror image of that on the British Museum stele 646 and the bronze situla, although it lacks any inscription. A goddess sits on a throne presenting a side view of her head facing the viewer's right, an almost frontal view of her body and a side view of her legs. She is crowned with the atef crown with the double plumes of Maat. She appears to be wearing a garment which reaches from her chest down to her ankles and has some decoration of ribbons around her neck and upper arms, perhaps signifying a collar and arm bands. With her left hand she holds a spear and shield before her and in her upraised right hand she wields a battle-axe which passes horizontally behind her crown. Wyatt (1984 327) begins his discussion of the iconography of this piece with the statement that, "the transfer of the form of a symbol from, say, Egypt to Ugarit did not necessarily entail the transfer of the content of the symbol". What he has in mind is the symbolism of

⁵⁴First published 1951, English translation 1971.

the atef crown, and its possible meaning when found on Anat in an Ugaritic representation of her.⁵⁵ However, I have not been able to find any statement to the effect that this relief comes from Ugarit; it appears to be without provenance. Its similarity to the two other representations suggests an Egyptian provenance, at least for its manufacture,⁵⁶ in which case his discussion of the transfer of an Egyptian motif into Ugaritic iconography is redundant. On the other hand, as it was usual Egyptian practice to accompany images with identifying inscriptions, whereas outside Egypt it was not, a case could be made for the manufacture of this relief by a non-Egyptian artist who copied this particular image; however, it is impossible to establish this with any certainty.

As for the identity of the goddess portrayed, to my mind there can scarcely be any doubt that this represents the goddess Anat since we have two other identical portraits both identified with an inscription, and no other similar representations apart from these three to confuse the issue. Walls (1992 83 n.5) dismisses Wyatt's (1984) views on the symbolism of this stele as "peculiar and unwarranted"! He then goes on to say,

The famous frontispiece of Cassuto's book (1971) is frequently identified as a representation of Anat. In fact, the feminine subject of this relief is depicted with a slightly protuberant belly, suggestive of pregnancy. ...There is no evidence that it portrays the Ugaritic goddess Anat.

To my mind, Walls' adjectives could equally be applied to his own thinking at this point! We have, to the best of our knowledge, only three representations of this kind, two of which are explicitly named 'Anat' and this one which has no inscription. It seems pointless to make a distinction between this one

⁵⁵He identifies the stele in the caption to his line drawing as "Stele of Anat from Ugarit" (328).

⁵⁶Or at least an Egyptian artist, or an artist who copied the Egyptian representation.

and the other two on the grounds that her belly is slightly more protuberant, and I suggest that Walls is being led by his agenda to find in Anat a virginal teenager who does not get pregnant, rather than assessing the piece in light of comparative material. A 'slightly protuberant belly' seems weak grounds for breaking the iconographic link between this relief, and the other two which are named as Anat. In terms of probability of this being Anat, I think it must be taken as very high.

2.5.2.2. Stele from Deir el-Madineh

Eaton (1964 105) has rather surprisingly introduced a fourth example of the armed seated goddess which he calls the stele from Deir el-Madineh dating to the reign of Ramesses II. In his own enumeration, we have the following: 1a, the British Museum stele 646; 1b, the vase from the Saitic period; 1c.iii, the stele in the Michaélidis collection, and 1c.i, the stele from Deir el-Madineh. The only reference he gives for this last piece is Grdseloff (1942 24, 31). However, if he had read more carefully, he would have realised that the stele Grdseloff is referring to at this point is in fact the British Museum stele 646!

2.5.2.3. Silver Vase from Bubaste

The weapons carried by Anat in the three pieces where she is seated bearing arms have been compared to an anonymous goddess engraved on a silver vase from Bubaste, dated to the 19th dynasty (Le Lasseur 1919 236-237 fig.99; Montet 1937 141 fig.179; Leclant 1960 8 n.8; Eaton 1964 105). Here we see a standing goddess facing left, torso *en face*, wearing a long robe down to her ankles with ribbons falling from the belt around her waist. In her left hand, which falls behind her, she holds an object which might be taken for an ankh, although this identification is dubious. In her right hand which is in front of her we find a shield with rounded top, and spear which is the height of the goddess. However, on her head is some kind of headdress not seen before when dealing with Anat or Astarte. The damaged nature of

the vase obscures part of the headdress, but it appears to be comprised of three large pieces of foliage, or feathers, resting on a headband, with what appears to be an uraeus at the front. However, there is nothing in this goddess to distinguish her from either Anat or Astarte (Leclant 1960 8 n.8) although the lack of a mace-axe inclines her more to Astarte, who is often portrayed with shield and spear,⁵⁷ than Anat, who in all identified representations of her as a warrior goddess, shows her with such a weapon. In fact, this is the weapon she hands to Merenptah on the Heliopolis column, even though she has no shield or spear. Of course, this may represent a goddess other than Anat or Astarte, and given the unusual headdress, I would be unwilling to put any name to this figure.

2.5.2.4. Cylinder Seal RS 5.089

Another image of a goddess often accepted to be that of the goddess Anat is cylinder seal RS 5.089 (Schaeffer 1949 39f. fig. 4; Barrelet 1955 250f.; Eaton 1964 118; Caquot and Sznycer 1980 pl.23a; Schaeffer-Forrer *et al.* 1983 16-21).⁵⁸ On it we see a winged female figure facing right with torso *en face* but otherwise in profile, wearing a long robe and horned helmet⁵⁹ which ends in a point on the top, sitting on a bull with her right arm at his mouth; with her left hand she holds the leash of a lion which rests its front paws on her knees. The lion looks over its back, mirrored on the right by a lioness (it appears to lack a mane); standing with a foot on each back is a naked figure *en face* apart from its head and feet. Kneeling on the head of each lion is another figure creating a frame which surrounds the naked figure. The one on the

⁵⁷See the figures in Le Lasseur (1919), Leclant (1960).

⁵⁸Dated to the 15th to early 14th century BC, Hematite, height 1.9cm, diameter 1cm. Musée du Louvre AO 17.242.

⁵⁹Although only one horn is visible, we can safely assume that this represents a pair of horns viewed from the side.

right, to which the standing figure looks, has its right hand on the standing figures shoulder, whilst the one on the left holds up what appears to be a crescent shape or pair of horns supporting either a jug or could even be a human head. What appears to be a human hand appears before the head of the standing figure, and another appears behind the head of the figure seated on the bull. Schaeffer (1949 39) did not hesitate to identify the winged goddess with Anat, and the young bull with Baal. He based his judgement on the fact that the goddess on the cylinder is young looking, wears a helmet similar to that of Baal on other monuments, and displays an affectionate embrace of the bull (who he believes may be Aleyan Baal). He also noted text *KTU* 1.10 which describes Anat with wings which the goddess on this seal possesses. Lions with rosettes on their shoulders identify them as belonging to the goddess of fertility according to Schaeffer (1949 40), which led him to see two fertility goddesses standing on the backs of the lions.

Without any inscription, we are limited at best to making an educated guess of the identity of the goddesses portrayed on this cylinder. With small portable objects such as cylinder seals, the archaeological context of the piece can only inform us of the location and approximate period of when the seal was dropped - what it cannot tell us is the place and time of manufacture. In other words, this seal may have been the property of a merchant perhaps, who brought it with him to Ugarit, or could have been a family heirloom. In this case, can we be so sure that the goddess is Anat and the bull Baal, or even that it was intended to represent deities familiar to Ugaritians?

Schaeffer-Forrer *et al.* (1983 18) give a number of similarities between this cylinder and other well-known styles; the rounded cheeks and shoulders relates it to the Mitannian style, her wings betray an Egyptian influence, but as the closest

parallel, a cylinder seal found in the Palace of Cadmos at Thebes,⁶⁰ dating to the 14th century B.C. and therefore slightly younger than the archaeological context of our seal. The theme of a goddess as mistress of the animals is derived from the Mesopotamian Inanna-Ishtar tradition of the third millennium (Barrelet 1955 260). However, we must separate thematic comparison from that of style, since it is possible to trace the development and dispersion of themes over vast spans of time and space, which renders themes unsuitable as an indication of the place and time of manufacture, whereas the style of manufacture is more likely to indicate a specific origin for a piece. Frankfort (1939 252f.) divided Syrian glyptic into three major groups; the First Syrian Group (c.1900-1700 B.C.) had much in common with contemporary Mesopotamian glyptic, but our cylinder falls into the category of the Second Syrian Group, dated to around the period 1700-1350 B.C., in which, he believes, the previously strong Mesopotamian influence has decayed due to the lack of fresh input (Frankfort 1939 260). This style is characterised as rather eclectic; we find isolated Mesopotamian figures but with altered attributes, a significant rise in non-Mesopotamian secondary motifs, and a strong Egyptian influence. Although today we might not accept Frankfort's rather patronising view of Syrian art which directly relates artistic merit to Mesopotamian standards, and sees Syrian artistic developments as 'decay', his basic observation of the eclectic nature of many of the seals from this period is still valid. The presence of wings on this figure indicates her divine nature, but may simply be due to Mesopotamian (Barrelet 1955) or Egyptian (Schaeffer-Forrer *et al.* 1983) influence, rather than an attempt by the artist to signify any particular deity from the Ugaritic pantheon. We are not even certain of the relationship between the seated winged figure and the standing naked figure; are they intended to represent the same deity in different aspects, or two different deities who

⁶⁰I.e. Thebes in Greece, not Egyptian Thebes (May 1984).

are linked through some act of cult or myth? If we were to attempt a guess at an underlying myth represented in this scene, then perhaps *KTU* 1.3.ii springs to mind with the head and hand symbolic of those Anat cut off her enemies, although it is very uncertain that we have a human head and not a jug with side-handles of some kind. Although a case can be made for this deity to be recognised as Anat, there are simply too many uncertainties for any conclusion to carry conviction.

2.5.2.5. Ivory Panel from Ugarit

This panel, found in 1952, represents one scene from a total of sixteen (eight on each side of a large panel 1m x 0.5m) which formed part of a bed and seems to depict scenes from the life of the king (Schaeffer 1954 51f. pl.8; Eaton 1964 114; Ward 1969). The panel that most interests us depicts a goddess and appears to have been the central panel of the face which looked onto the bed (Schaeffer 1954 53), which may indicate the importance of the scene depicted. On it we find a goddess with her arms around two smaller figures who each suck at her breasts. The goddess stands *en face* but with her feet in profile in Egyptian style. She is dressed in a long robe and we see two pairs of wings, one pair emanates from her shoulders and rises up either side of her head, the other pair is partially obscured by the two smaller figures behind which each wing is shown. She has the Hathor hair style and from her forehead sprouts a pair of horns which from their general shape, could be imagined to be the same type of horn seen in profile in the cylinder seal discussed above. Surmounting the horns is a disc which contains, according to Schaeffer (1954), stylised lightning and stars, and which Wyatt (1983 274) has more recently described as a solar-disc. The height of the two smaller figures is a little over the waist of the goddess and they appear to be mirror images of each other. Schaeffer (1954) describes them as 'adolescents' because of their smaller size. This is a possibility, but we must not forget that frequently the relative importance of figures in ancient art is illustrated by relative size (Korpel 1990 90), and therefore it is also possible that these

two figures represent adults, naturally of a lesser status than the goddess, a fact reinforced by their status as sucklings of the goddess. Compare, for example, the relative sizes of the Egyptian pharaoh and the goddess who suckles him (Bonhême and Forgeau 1988 pls. 26-27). Schaeffer (1954 55) reports Dussaud's comments to him that the pair may represent the young king and his double. However, he states that the king is usually shown in a long tunic in Ugaritic art whilst the naked torso and skirt is more a symbol of divine status; these figures may then be a pair of young gods,⁶¹ or perhaps a reduplication of one god for the sake of symmetry. Either suggestion is plausible. However I believe that the solution is to be found in the evident Egyptian influence observed in this series of panels.⁶² The series of panels appears to represent scenes from the life of the king, and accepting the strong Egyptian influence in the overall style of this series of panels, it would not be surprising if the Ugaritic king was depicted in Egyptian style clothing for this central and most important scene; a constant reaffirmation and reminder that the king has divine patronage. In fact, we find that many of the figures in the series of panels are dressed in a short style skirt (Caquot and Sznycer 1980 28-29). However, we should not overlook the fact that suckling, in human terms, is an activity of the new-born, although in Egyptian thought, the suckling of the king by a goddess occurred as a *rite de passage*, when the king was born, when he was crowned, and when he died (Ward 1969 235; Bonhême and Forgeau 1988 85); at each of these three points the king was like a new-born in his new existence, and as such was afforded the protection of a goddess. This explains why the king, sucking at the breast of a goddess, is depicted as

⁶¹Compare the story in *KTU* 1.23 in which the birth of the divine pair Shachar and Shalim is recounted, and who are said to suck at the teats of the Lady, *ynqm bap dd št*, line 59, 61.

⁶²Schaeffer's (1954) description of these ivory panels is full of allusion to Egyptian style and costume, and he even speaks of "un choix délibéré du style égyptien pour les représentations concernant la cour d'Ugarit" (p.58). Compare also Ward (1969) who believes that these panels have been heavily influenced by the artistic style of Amenophis III.

a child, sometimes wearing the sidelock of youth (Bonhême and Forgeau 1988 85). Whether or not the symbolism was understood in Ugarit, the basic mother-child relationship between the king and the goddess who suckled him could have been concretely expressed by depicting the king as a child, irrespective of the actual age of the king. In this case, I believe that it is highly probable that this couple represents the king, doubled either because it represents the king and his *ka*,⁶³ or more simply because of the symmetrical configuration of the series of panels, with this one in the middle.

Turning now to the identity of the goddess, Schaeffer (1954 55) believes her to be Anat on the basis of her “mystérieux et autoritaire” aspect, coupled with text *KTU* 1.15.ii.26f. which, he believes, describes Asherah and Anat as a pair of divine wet-nurses (Caquot and Sznycer 1980 19). Oldenburg (1969 88) sees the horns and wings in agreement with Anat of the myths. Ward (1969 229) also believes this goddess to be Anat, pointing to the Hathorian character of this goddess, and the fact that in Egypt, Anat took on the role of Hathor as mother of the king. However, without an accompanying inscription, we cannot be certain. We know of at least three goddesses at Ugarit who possibly suckle the king: Athirat, Anat⁶⁴ and Raḥmay. The fact that this goddess has wings and horns does not necessarily indicate that she is Anat, since they are both iconographical devices to indicate the divine status of the female figure, and considering the strong Egyptian influence of this piece, the Hathorian elements of this goddess may simply be a result of this influence rather than pointing to a particular goddess. Although Anat can be described in bovine terms, not all goddesses with horns are Anat. However, given the provenance of this piece, it

⁶³Ward (1969 231) believes what we have in the Ugaritic ivory is an erroneous adaptation of the motif of two goddesses nursing the new-born king and his *ka*, first seen in the temple of Hatshepsut at Deir in the 16th Dynasty.

⁶⁴See my discussion below for restoring [*nt*] in *KTU* 1.15.ii.27.

should not be surprising that the goddess depicted was considered to be a Canaanite goddess, and Anat, Athirat or Rahmay remain strong candidates, despite the Egyptian influence.

2.5.2.6. Stele from Temple of Amenhotep III Beth Shan

This stele, coming from the temple of Amenhotep III at Beth Shan, depicts a goddess with very similar iconography as the stele found in the temple of Ramesses III (see above), although there are some interesting differences (Rowe 1930 19-21 pl.48.2; Vincent 1937 646 n.1; Rowe 1940 8, 81 pl.35.5 and 49A.1; Eaton 1964 112; Leclant 1960 9; Pritchard 1954 #475; Wyatt 1984 331). The goddess stands on the left of the stele, her head, legs and feet facing right, her torso *en face*, in typical Egyptian style. Like the Anat stele, she wears what appears to be the white crown of upper Egypt, flanked with feathers of Maat, but unlike Anat, the atef crown is horned, and appears to have a single streamer falling down at the back. The goddess is dressed in a transparent garment which flares out at the bottom just above her feet, and through it the outline of both her legs can be clearly seen. In her right hand she holds an ankh, and in her left a papyrus (?) sceptre. We can see two vertical parallel lines in front of her crown, obviously intended to take an inscription, but never filled; thus we have an anonymous goddess.

Rowe (1930 and 1940) was the first to identify her as Astarte, and has been generally followed. Evidence of an Astarte cult in Beth Shan after the Israelite occupation is generally sought in 1 Sam 31.10 (e.g. Eaton 1964 112), but compare the text in I Chr. 10.10 which makes no mention of Astarte. Furthermore, this stele dates to the early 14th century B.C., which is many hundreds of years earlier than the events described in the Hebrew narrative, and is likely to be many more hundreds of years removed from the date of composition of the text. Although it is possible that the narrative has retained some ancient memory of, or records the survival of, an

Astarte cult at Beth Shan, a great many changes could have taken place over so long a time span, and I would only admit this evidence with the greatest of caution. More relevant is the stele dating to the reign of Ramesses III (see above) which dates only three centuries later, and which actually names the goddess as Anat. The similarity in style suggests either that the Amenophis III stele should be accepted as Anat, or that the iconography of different goddesses could be very similar in second millennium Egyptian-occupied Palestine. What it does *not* suggest is that we should name the goddess on the Amenophis III stele as Astarte because of the mention of an Astarte temple in a text possibly dating a millennium later, and use this to prove that in the Ramesses III stele, similar iconography proves that Anat is merged with Astarte.

2.5.2.7. Bronze axe-head from Al-Biqâ

Dated by its iconographic style to the second half of the 2nd millennium B.C. by Barrelet (1958 pl.XXXVa), this small bronze, which is possibly an axe-head, has two figures on it back to back.⁶⁵ It is fenestrated, each side bearing the image of a goddess. One side has a winged figure, the other depicts a naked female, who appears to be holding something in her upraised hands, and is very reminiscent of the Qedesht figure. The winged figure is shown *en face*, with Hathorian hairstyle and no headdress. She wears a long robe with flounces, which is Mesopotamian in style. Her arms are bent and her open hands are at head height; her wings are attached at the shoulder and are curved towards the top, like winged warrior goddesses in Mesopotamia (cf. Barrelet 1955 pl.XXI). Her feet are shown in profile. The composite appearance of this goddess, apparently combining Mesopotamian and Egyptian iconographic motifs, corresponds to cylinder seals of 2nd millennium Syria

⁶⁵Louvre AO 4654. No archaeological context. A provenance is given in the inventory of the Louvre as "Aïnjarr, Coelé-Syrie", although this cannot be confirmed. Total height: 142mm; Width 49-60mm. Possibly a bronze ceremonial axe-head, see Barrelet (1958) for a fuller description.

designated by Frankfort (1939) the Second Syrian Group. Barrelet sees in the wings a clue to the identity of this goddess; she believes that it is Anat, analogous to the goddess on cylinder seal RS 5.089 identified by Schaeffer (1949).

As was the case with cylinder seal RS 5.089 and the goddess on the ivory panel, there is no inscriptional evidence to prove the identity of these two goddesses. Indeed, we are at a loss as to know whether we have two distinct goddesses on this bronze, or in fact two different portrayals of the same goddess, although it is interesting to note the same juxtaposition of winged and naked figure on the cylinder seal. Considering the strong Mesopotamian influence in the dress of the goddess, it would be perfectly reasonable to assume that the wings, rather than being an attribute of any particular goddess, are simply the markers of divine status found on innumerable deities of Mesopotamian art.

2.5.2.8. 'Anat' stele from Ugarit RS 2.[038]

Among a group of three stelae found immediately outside the wall of the Baal Temple is one stele, now mutilated with its head missing, which has been taken to be an image of Anat (Schaeffer 1931 12f. pl.8.1; 1949 x, 97, pl.22; Frankfort 1954 137; Pritchard 1954 #488; Eaton 1964 117; Wyatt 1984 332; Yon 1991 291f. fig. 6.3, 9c).⁶⁶ The goddess is enveloped in a long robe which appears to be the wing of a bird. This has clear connections with the Egyptian falcon divinities who protect the dead, and the goddess Hathor, very common in New Kingdom Egypt. In her right hand is an ankh, and in her left she holds a lance emphasising her role as a goddess of war. Comparing the length of the lance with that in the 'Baal' stele⁶⁷ with which it was

⁶⁶RS 2.[038]. Originally dated to the Middle Ugarit period (Schaeffer 1949), c. 2000-1800 BC, it is now placed in the 14th-13th centuries BC based on stylistic relationships with New Kingdom Egypt (Yon 1991 293). The so called 'Anat' stele measures 93 cm high, 37 cm wide.

⁶⁷RS 2.[037], Yon (1991 288f.).

found, it is claimed that the length of the body of the goddess is smaller in comparison to that of the god, which is a reflection of iconographic style which portrays goddesses smaller than gods although the validity of such a comparison remains dubious to me. Schaeffer (1949) claimed that she wore a torque which identified her as a deity of the northern torque wearers, but a close examination of the published photographs does not reveal this detail, unlike the 'Baal' stele which clearly has a torque around his neck. Her flat sandals with straps are reminiscent of the mountain dwellers of northern Syria and Asia minor. This stele was found next to the stele with the god with the high headdress ('Baal' stele), and it is assumed, both by Schaeffer (1949) and Yon (1991) that they constitute the divine couple Baal and Anat, the two "assument les fonctions de divinités de la prospérité agricole et de l'élevage" (Yon 1991 292). However, without any inscription, we are again faced with the problem of identifying the goddess on the stele from style alone.

The only clue to her identity has been taken from the fact that this figure is dressed in what appears to be the wing of a bird, and carries a spear with its obvious connections with warrior activity. As with the cylinder seal and other representations, we have to ask ourselves if Anat was the only deity to have wings in Ugaritic iconography. In the few myths we have from Ugarit, Anat is not the only divine being to have the capacity of flight. The creature that El pinched from the mud in order to cure Keret (*KTU* 1.16.v-vi) flies to the side of Keret.⁶⁸ We should also remember that in Mesopotamian and Egyptian iconography, two great cultural influences at Ugarit, many deities can appear with wings. In view of the above, identification of a figure simply on the basis of it being winged must remain highly tenuous.

⁶⁸*tdu* 'she flew' from the root D'Y.

2.5.2.9. Bronze figure from Tel Dan

Negbi (1964) published a report of a bronze figurine from Tel Dan which depicts a marching figure with raised right arm, and left arm extended forwards.⁶⁹ This figure is dressed in a long belted robe and has a Hathor wig, although there is no crown. Clenched hollow hands suggest that it originally held something in each hand, and Negbi suggests a mace or axe in the raised hand, and a spear or shield in the left. She then goes on to compare this character with Anat on the British museum stele 646 and Astarte on the cylinder seal from Bethel, concluding that this bronze figure represents one of these two goddesses.

The attitude of the arms, one held up and the other extended forward, coupled with the placing of one foot in front of the other, does suggest a striding warrior type of figurine, labelled 'Type III: Female Warriors in Smiting Pose' by Negbi (1976 84). In this category she lists six known figurines, only three of which wear head-gear comparable with the male smiting figurines and none wear short skirts, unlike the male figurines. Why Anat should be chosen as a candidate for this bronze is unclear. We have no identified depictions of Anat in traditional smiting pose; when she is shown armed, she is seated. Once she is portrayed standing and presenting a weapon to the pharaoh, but this is not in a traditional smiting posture. Every identified portrayal shows her with the white crown and feathers of Maat, not a Hathor wig. Anat did not have a monopoly on violent behaviour, and these bronzes could represent several different goddesses.

The following four items are introduced by Wyatt (1984) in his discussion on the iconography of the goddess Anat, and so for completeness will be discussed here.

⁶⁹Numbered 1627 in Negbi's (1976) catalogue.

2.5.2.10. Balou'ah Stele

In the Balou'ah stele (Horsfield and Vincent 1932 417f. pl.11, 12; Drioton 1933 353f.; Crowfoot 1934; Wyatt 1984 332), dating to the twelfth or eleventh century, we see three figures; on the left a king, wearing the Egyptian double crown, stands before two deities. In the centre is a bearded god with full and crescent moons on his shoulders and who faces the king on the left; behind him on the far right is a goddess wearing the white crown with feathers of Maat but without horns, and who also faces left towards the king. Apart from the fact that the goddess wears the atef crown, there is no other indication that she is Anat.

2.5.2.11. Bronze of Couple in Chariot

This piece⁷⁰ comprises a chariot cart in which stand two asymmetrical figures (Negbi 1976 #22, pl.5; Wyatt 1984 332). The larger figure wears the white crown with feathers of Maat and a pair of ram's horns, surmounted by a sun-disc, and has its right arm around the smaller figure who wears a conical crown, possibly the white crown, with an arrow sheaf on its back. From the position of the arms of the figures, it appears as if the smaller figure originally held the reins and guided the chariot, whilst the larger figure held a weapon or shield in its outstretched left arm. Negbi (1976 #22) describes the larger figure as a male with atef crown whilst the smaller is female, and is the male figure's consort. However, as Wyatt (1984 332) has pointed out, another pair of figures (Negbi 1976 #12) quite definitely shows the male as the smaller of the two, and there is no compelling reason to see the larger figure as a male in this case. Wyatt goes on to suggest that perhaps the larger figure with the

⁷⁰Louvre, AO.22265, Phoenicia, unknown provenance. Bronze, solid-cast in lost wax process. Max. height 0.133m.

atef crown should be understood to be Anat, whilst the smaller figure is Reshef.⁷¹ Whilst this is quite plausible, again we are hindered by a lack of inscriptions to guide us in our interpretation. With the crowns we see an Egyptian influence, and it could be quite possible at this point to see in this couple, a divine protector and human charioteer, quite possibly a Pharaoh or king.

2.5.2.12. Goddess with Atef Crown

Another bronze figurine⁷² from the Negbi catalogue presented by Wyatt in his discussion is Negbi 1976 #1626 (Wyatt 1984 332). This female deity has a short wig topped by the uraeus and a pair of horns, surmounted by the white crown with feathers of Maat, and flanked by two ureaues, each sitting on one of the horns which are far wider than normal for this size of crown. The goddess wears a belt and a long pleated robe; her left arm is extended forward with a clenched and hollow fist, and her right hand is held up away from her body. Wyatt states that this is the only example of a goddess wearing the reed bundle variety of the atef crown, and although he may be right for bronzes, we may compare the reed bundle crown worn by the goddess Anat on the stele in the L. Scheurleer Museum.

2.5.2.13. Bronze of Goddess wearing Atef Crown

Finally we come to an intriguing figurine⁷³ of a heavily armed goddess wearing a wig and white crown (or conical cap?) with horns and uraeus (Negbi 1976 #1317 pl.21; Wyatt 1984 332). She appears to have a shaft-axe in her right hand and dagger in her left. Two sheaths are suspended on a strap which goes around her body,

⁷¹The fact that the smaller figure has an arrow sheaf on his back could suggest connections with the god Reshef, who had definite connections with the bow (Fulco 1976).

⁷²Louvre AO.4049. Fakra (Lebanon) unknown context. Height 0.175m.

⁷³Louvre AO.20160. Syria, provenance unknown. Height 0.123m.

one attached to her stomach and a second to her back. She also seems to be wearing a short skirt more appropriate to the male smiting figure, than the more usual long robe or skirt of a goddess. Wyatt (1984 332) feels that her crown is anomalous and may originally have had feathers of a perishable nature attached to it to make it an atef crown. However, given the various combinations of features that make up different crowns, I would hesitate before thinking it necessary for this particular crown to be made to conform to a better known pattern simply on the basis that this anonymous figurine is supposed to represent Anat.

The intriguing nature of this figurine lies in its dress. The protuberant breasts indicate that the figure is female. However, normal dress for a female smiting figurine (to which it most closely conforms) is a long skirt (Negbi 1976 84) whereas this figurine wears a short skirt, which is normal for a male smiting figurine. This divergence from the norm brings to mind the passage in pBeatty VII in which Anat is addressed as the 'Victorious Goddess, the woman who acts like a warrior, who wears a skirt like men and a sash like women'. In our discussion of pBeatty VII it was suggested that cross-gender dressing by Anat was a feature of her Semitic character rather than an Egyptian invention. This bronze has no provenance but is thought to be Syrian; however, it seems to be the almost perfect embodiment of the description of Anat from pBeatty VII, since this female figurine wears a skirt more appropriate to male figurines, has a sash or belt around her body (compare the belt, *ḥbš*, to which Anat attaches heads and hands in *KTU* 1.3.ii) and is loaded with weaponry - a clear indication of this female figure being victorious in war and acting like a warrior.

With all this in mind it is very tempting to name this figure as Anat and I would like to include this piece as a 'very probable', but without an inscription it is impossible to be certain, and because of the singularity of this piece we cannot compare it to anything known to be Anat from Egypt. The main problem is that Anat is not the only goddess who can bear arms and act as a warrior, nor is she the only

goddess portrayed in the atef crown, although this figurine wears only the white crown without side feathers. However, if there was any one piece I would like to think portrayed Anat, this one would seem to fit very closely to what we know to have been her character.

2.6. DISCUSSION

2.6.1. Iconography

It might be thought that I have been excessively cautious in my survey of 'anonymous' iconography which has been attributed as Anat by various scholars. However, it is all too easy to attribute a name to a statue or relief which cannot be verified from inscriptional evidence. We have seen that Egyptian iconography of Anat can be divided into two categories. Unarmed she is portrayed in a thoroughly Egyptian style which is used to represent many goddesses, not just Anat, although the use of the atef crown seems to be limited to the 'Canaanite' gods in particular. Therefore, when we find pieces which depict a goddess with the atef crown, it is impossible to distinguish between Anat or Astarte, even if the figure carries weapons, since both Anat and Astarte bear arms. The second category is seen in the relief of a goddess seated on a low backed chair with shield, spear and mace-axe. In my mind, this can almost certainly be named as Anat because of its similarity with the other two pieces which explicitly name this goddess as Anat.

When we are presented with a goddess with wings it is equally difficult to ascertain her identity with any real certainty. We have seen that Anat is not the only divine being to have the capacity for flight in Ugaritic myth. We have also seen that Ugaritic art, heavily influenced by Mesopotamian and Egyptian style, draws on the

motifs found in these two styles to use in its own. The addition of wings to a divine being may simply be use of a motif that indicates the divine status of the figure, but even if they are intended to identify a particular deity, we are still no closer to asserting with any great confidence that such a figure is Anat.

2.6.2. Anat's Relationship with the Pharaoh

Although some of the pieces discussed in this chapter appear to have been commissioned by non-royal citizens, most of the iconographic portrayals of Anat are connected with the Pharaoh. The relationship between the king of Egypt and this Canaanite goddess seems to have developed a dual aspect. First, we see Anat in her role of warrior goddess as early as Sethos I, who named the chariot horse-team who led him into battle after Amun and Anat. It appears that Anat affords her protection to the king as she guides him into the midst of battle. In the Rhind ostrakon we see the connection maintained between Anat and the war chariot of the king; this time she and Astarte are the 'hands' of the chariot. This close relationship continued and developed with Sethos I's son, Ramesses II. A sword of Ramesses is named 'Anat-is-Victorious'⁷⁴ and a dog of his which is shown attacking a captured enemy soldier, is called 'Anat-is-Protection'. In all of these we see the theme of Anat protecting the king in battle, guiding his chariot, his sword, and as concerned for the king as is a loyal dog. Not only does Anat protect the king, she also gives him authority over foreign lands through victory in battle, for example on the statue of Ramesses and Anat standing, or the Northern Obelisk from Tanis. On the column from Heliopolis, Anat hands Merenptah a mace-axe, the weapon we most often see her carrying, and in the text she urges the king to kill his enemies. At Medinet Habu we found Anat and

⁷⁴Compare her epithet in pBeatty VII, 'Victorious Goddess'.

Astarte spoken of as the 'shield' of Ramesses III, alongside Montu and Seth who accompany the king into battle.

However, another side to this relationship is also seen in the iconography and texts. In the statue of Ramesses II and Anat seated from Tanis, we see the goddess with her hand resting protectively on the shoulder of the pharaoh. In her discourse, we find that she addresses herself as the mother of the king, and Ramesses is her 'beloved son'. On the standing statue also we find this mother-son relationship; Anat declares 'I am your mother' whilst Ramesses is 'beloved of Anat'. The limestone doorpost also bears an inscription that declares Anat to be the mother of Ramesses, and on one of the stelae from Wadi Tumeilat we find a reference to Anat having 'borne you like Seth', an obvious reference to the mother-son relationship between these two figures. This relationship between goddess and pharaoh is not unusual in Egypt (Blok 1930 186) and is usually envisioned as between the king and the goddess Hathor. However, this especially close relationship appears to have existed only between Ramesses II and Anat, with no mention of Anat as mother for later kings, even though they continue to venerate Anat in her warrior aspect.

One aspect of the relationship between Anat and the pharaoh that has been left to one side is the phrase that appears on the Northern Obelisk from Tanis and on the Marriage stele of Ramesses II, '*mhr* Anat'. There is considerable controversy over whether this should be translated as 'suckling of Anat' (*WAS* 115-116; Montet 1933 70; Stadelmann 1967 90, 92; Leclant 1975 254; Bowman 1978 233) based on an Egyptian root *hr* 'to milk', or 'warrior of Anat' (Couroyer 1964; Zorn 1991) taking it as a loan-word from Semitic.⁷⁵

⁷⁵See Couroyer (1964) for a detailed history of the debate.

We have already seen above that there was a strong mother-son relationship between Ramesses II and Anat seen in both texts and iconography, and we know that other pharaohs could be portrayed as suckling from a divine mother, such as Amenhotep II and Seti I.⁷⁶ In the Pyramid texts, the dead king is nursed by various goddesses, thus demonstrating his status as a new-born in the afterlife, and emphasising his divine status (Blok 1930 188; Leclant 1951; Bonhême and Forgeau 1988). Although not connected with royalty, the phrase in pLeiden I 343 recto 6, 10-11 which reads, 'Behold, I have sucked from the breasts of Anat, Cow of Seth'⁷⁷ (Grdseloff 1942 27; Massart 1954 70f.) spoken by the magician expresses in concrete terms the same ideology as that seen in the royal context, in that as a suckling of the goddess, the magician assimilates the strength and divine protection afforded by the goddess within the framework of a mother-son relationship.

In Couroyer's (1964) analysis of the lexeme *mhr*, he found it occurred in the following four contexts: 1) Papyrus Anastasi I, 2) The epithet of Ramesses II, *mhr* Anat, 3) The epithet of Ramesses III, *mhr*, 4) Ptolemaic texts. In pAnastasi I, which dates to the period of Ramesses II, the spelling *mhr* is almost always followed by the sign of a man wielding a club in both hands, the determinative for violent action, but is sometimes accompanied by the sign of a seated child with hand to mouth. Within this text, the lexeme *mhr* relates to a well-trained soldier, and it would seem out of place to give it the meaning of 'suckling'. However, the spelling *mhr* in the inscriptions of Ramesses II is used with the determinative of a seated child with hand to mouth, thus suggestive of 'suckling'. On the other hand, the epithet of *mhr* for Ramesses III

⁷⁶Eaton (1964 85). Amenophis II is shown suckling from the goddess Hathor, who is in the form of a cow, in a group from Déir-el-Bahri (Boreux 1926 pl. LI). See also plates 26 & 27 in Bonhême and Forgeau (1988).

⁷⁷Couroyer (1964 453f.) has convincingly demonstrated that the phrase "bull/cow of Seth" on the Tanis obelisk does not refer to Anat, as in the Leiden Papyrus, but is an epithet of Ramesses II.

is used in a similar way to that in the pAnastasi I, but here it has the determinative of the seated child with hand to mouth. Couroyer (1964 452) points out that the determinative of seated child with hand to mouth is also found in relation with other military terms for soldiers, and that it does not necessarily imply the idea of a helpless child; he believes it could equally imply the idea of the youthfulness of the soldier. He concludes that in sources from the Ramesside era, *mhr* is related to the Semitic, and its use in Ptolemaic times for 'suckling' is due to a reinterpretation of the word, giving it the false etymology of Egyptian *hr*.

There is some evidence for the lexeme *mhr* 'milk jug, milk jug carrier' in the Middle Kingdom, but it really does not become well known until the New Kingdom (*WAS* 115-116). Since the earliest occurrence of the lexeme *mhr* as an epithet of the king seems to be concurrent with the rise in prominence of the cult of Anat, there is a distinct possibility that the word was taken over from the Semitic Anat cult, where the phrase *mhr 'nt* had the meaning of 'warrior of Anat', clearly seen in the Ugaritic texts. However, we cannot rule out the possibility that the adoption of this phrase raised in Egyptian minds the theological principle of the divine nurturing of the Pharaoh, based on the Egyptian verb *hr*.⁷⁸ In this case, *mhr* might have had a dual meaning to the Egyptian ear;⁷⁹ 'warrior', from its Semitic etymology and basis in the Anat cult, and 'suckling', based on the Egyptian root which, coincidentally, worked equally as well as an epithet of the Pharaoh. We have already seen that the particularly close relationship between Anat and the king was only prominent for Ramesses II and it is only for this king that there seems enough evidence to suggest *mhr 'nt* meant 'suckling of Anat'. As a 'suckling' of Anat, the Pharaoh would be imbued with the

⁷⁸There is no evidence to suggest, however, that an Egyptian lexeme *mhr* 'suckling' existed before this time, which Eaton (1964 87) believes came to be associated with the Semitic loan word.

⁷⁹It was certainly distinguished in spelling (*WAS* 115-116; Bowman 1978 231).

attributes of his divine mother, and thus become a formidable 'warrior'. This would explain the use of the child determinative⁸⁰ equally as well as assuming it to show the idea of youthfulness of the warrior.

2.6.3. Anat in Egyptian myth

The introduction of a cult of Anat into Egypt by the Hyksos, and its subsequent adoption by the kings of the 19th dynasty and those that followed, introduced a character into Egyptian myth who was interpreted in terms of the similar Egyptian goddess Hathor-Sekhmet. Hathor was the mother of Horus, and thus the mother of the king, whom she suckled (Bleeker 1973; Bonhême and Forgeau 1988; Walls 1992 53), which is the role Anat played for Ramesses II. However, there was a brutal side to the character of Hathor. In the myth, 'Deliverance of Mankind from Destruction' (*ANET* 10-11), we see a darker side of Hathor, who in the form of Sekhmet is intent on destroying mankind, and whose motive appears to be simply that of blood-lust. The deceit planned by Ra, who ordered the battle field to be flooded with blood-coloured beer before the battle recommenced, and which the goddess greedily drank, causing her to forget her original intentions, prevented the complete destruction of mankind. The three versions of this text are found on the walls of the tomb of Sethos I, Ramesses II and Ramesses III (*ANET* 10). This flurry of interest in the story of Hathor-Sekhmet, which comes at a time when the veneration of Anat by the pharaoh is at its peak, may have arisen from a knowledge among the Egyptian royal household of the Ugaritic myth related in *KTU* 1.3.ii. Indeed, the graphic images of Hathor-Sekhmet wallowing in the blood red beer which she drinks is certainly suggestive of Anat wading knee-deep in the blood and gore of slain warriors.

⁸⁰Gardiner (1957 443) lists the "child sitting (on lap) with hand to mouth" in his sign-list A.17, where he lists it as the determinative, 'young'.

However, any similarities that exist between these two myths are only at the surface level; a more thoroughgoing comparison highlights the underlying differences between them. The Egyptian myth gives a motive for the slaughter; humans plotted against Ra and so had to be punished, although the wholesale slaughter planned by Sekhmet seems to go beyond the intentions of Ra. However, the Ugaritic myth appears to lack any apparent motive: despite the fact that we lack the beginning of *KTU* 1.3.ii, there is nothing in what follows of the Baal cycle to suggest that Anat's behaviour is motivated by anything other than blood-lust, and is perhaps symbolic of the treatment of captives before her cultic statue (see my discussion of the Baal Cycle below). Again, in the Egyptian myth Ra intervenes on behalf of mankind to avert their total destruction, but in the Ugaritic myth, there is no intervention, and Anat does not appear to act out of a desire to destroy mankind. In the Egyptian myth, Hathor-Sekhmet is deceived by the blood-coloured beer and hence fails to achieve her desire, but in the Ugaritic myth, Anat appears to wreak havoc and destruction until she was sated (*šb'*). Given these important distinctions between the two traditions, we are hardly in a position to suggest a literary dependence either way; the two traditions seem to express theological concerns native to their respective contexts although couched in similar descriptive language. This being said, there remains the possibility that the Egyptian myth enjoyed favour under the 19th dynasty rulers because of the popularity of Anat with the kings of this period, who were thereby introduced to the Canaanite tradition of Anat's character.

There was some confusion over the paternity of Anat in Egypt. On the granite bowl published by Redford, Ptah is the first deity in the list to whom offerings are presented, whilst Anat is third and is the only deity whose father is named, 'Anat daughter of Ptah'. However, in pBeatty I, and pBeatty VII, it is Ra who is her father. This discrepancy is probably to be explained by the differing provenance of these pieces; it is likely that the bowl was made at Memphis, a centre of worship for Ptah,

whilst the Chester Beatty papyri was probably influenced by Heliopolitan theology which venerated Ra as the head of the pantheon. This same dichotomy is seen in the paternity of Astarte, who is the daughter of Ptah in pAmherst, but who is the daughter of Ra in pBeatty I. We could argue that Anat's Egyptian position is a reflection of her status in the Canaanite religion where she is a daughter of El who is the head of the Ugaritic pantheon, but I think this overstates the case; normal theological principles at work in both cultures see deities as sons or daughters of the chief god of the pantheon, and depending on the provenance of a particular Egyptian piece, we are presented with a different forebear.

As one of the Canaanite deities in Egypt, Anat is sometimes associated with Astarte, although there is no unanimous tradition. On the granite bowl we find Anat, Astarte and Qedesht as three distinct goddesses, and on all of the monuments of Ramesses II, Anat is treated as a goddess who remained distinct from Astarte. However, the Rhind ostrakon, dated somewhere within the nineteenth dynasty, presents us with the pair 'Anat and Astarte', which warns us against assuming a theological consensus on these goddesses by the ancient Egyptians. A more accurately dated monument which mentions Anat and Astarte as a pair is the inscription of Ramesses III at Medinet Habu, 'Montu and Seth are with [him in] every fray, Anat and Astarte are his shield'. Here, Anat and Astarte are paired as a balance to the male pair Seth and Montu, all four are seen as being with the king in battle. We also find this divine pair in the myth related on pBeatty I, where Neith suggests that they be given to Seth.

Anat in Egypt was very likely thought of as the consort of Seth (see above on pBeatty I). In the Northern Obelisk from Tanis, Anat appears among the epithets of Ramesses II, along with Montu and Seth, which is very similar to what we find on the Medinet Habu inscription of Ramesses III, where we are told that Seth and Montu || Anat and Astarte accompany the king into battle. Thus it seems that Anat and Seth

are paired also by virtue of the similarities in their characterisation; both are prestigious warriors. A more intimate relationship between Anat and Seth may be alluded to in the Marriage stele where Ramesses II is son of Seth, nursling of Anat, and a bull like Seth. Again we find on the stele from Wadi Tumeilat that Anat has 'borne' Ramesses II 'like Seth'. Whether we are to imply from this that Ramesses is thought of as the offspring of Anat and Seth is difficult to tell, although it would not be surprising in an Egyptian context. However, we should note that it is only with Ramesses II that we find this sort of material. The relationship of Anat to the gods of Egypt is not clear cut since although pBeatty I seems to show Anat (and Astarte) as the consort of Seth, we find that pBeatty VII can no longer be accepted as evidence for a sexual relationship between Anat and Seth, and the passage in the Harris Magical Papyrus suggests that Anat and Astarte were considered the consorts of Horus rather than Seth. It seems that in Egyptian theology her status within the pantheon was somewhat fluid, determined by the demands of the context rather than having a fixed consort relationship. However, in connection with pBeatty VII it is intriguing that it is Anat who mediated between Seth and Ra. Perhaps this myth has been influenced by the role of Anat in Canaanite myth where she mediates between Baal and El, and if this is the case then like the Baal myth, she may be mediating between her lover and father.

2.7. CONCLUSIONS

Early Egyptian material shows us there was an Anat cult among the West Semites at a period slightly later than the evidence for her cult at Mari. However, a royal cult of Anat did not appear in Egypt until the 19th dynasty, where under the aegis of Ramesses II she became a prominent figure, acting as mother to the king, and his protectress in war. During his reign, the character of Anat was a complex mixture

of warrior goddess and tender mother, which is similar to that witnessed in Ugaritic myth where she can be gratuitously violent one moment, and extremely tender the next. After the death of Ramesses II, the tender aspect of her character seems to have slipped into the background, and Anat the warrior goddess became dominant, both in royal iconography and texts, as well as private dedications, magical incantations and mythical exploits.

We have seen that Anat's role in Egyptian myth may have been influenced by her Semitic counterpart, especially as we know her from Ugarit; however, we found no evidence to suggest that Egyptian myth itself was based on Semitic myth. In other words, the Egyptian narrative plots in which we encounter Anat appear to be indigenous to Egypt, addressing specifically Egyptian theological concerns, and the role which Anat plays within these myths seems to fit her Egyptian role. This implies that we should not use Egyptian myth as a source to plunder when we have exhausted the Ugaritic material, since the Egyptians appear to have adopted her into their pantheon and thereby transformed her into an Egyptian goddess. On the other hand, however, there are general characteristics which are shared by Egyptian and Ugaritic Anat. The portrayal of her as an aggressive warrior goddess is perhaps her most dominant characteristic in Egyptian myth, as is also the case in the Ugaritic myths. Less prominent, but still important, is the tender side of her nature. She is the protective mother of Ramesses II and is the goddess who mediates between Seth (the Great God) and Ra when Seth has become ill with the effects of the seed-poison. This too is a characteristic of Anat found in the Ugaritic myths where we witness her mediation between Baal and El, not only in the section concerning Baal's palace, but also when she retrieves Baal's body for burial. We have also seen a strong tradition in Egyptian theology to link the two goddesses Anat and Astarte as a pair. This is not syncretism: the two goddesses are not fused into a single entity, and quite often they act quite independently of each other. Once again we should not be surprised to find that

this echoes the situation we find in Ugaritic theology where we find the goddesses Anat and Astarte paired⁸¹ but who also display a vigorous life of their own within the myths (although Anat appears more an active goddess than Astarte).

In conclusion, it seems that the cult of Anat flourished under Ramesses II who was perhaps responsible for her elevation from obscure Canaanite goddess to the prominent position she held during his long reign. The character of Anat we find in his lifetime echoes that of the Ugaritic Anat, as a fierce warrior goddess and tender figure, although her role as mother of the king appears to be a typically Egyptian extension of her character.⁸² After his death, Anat still continued to be honoured by the pharaohs although the emphasis shifted from her motherly aspect to focus specifically on her aggressive warrior nature.

⁸¹For example in *KTU* 1.14.vi.26f., 1.114.9f.

⁸²Unless we accept the restoration ['*nt*] in *KTU* 1.15.ii.27.

CHAPTER THREE

ANAT IN THE ILIMILKU TEXTS

3.1. Introduction	139
3.2. Titles.....	139
3.2.1. <i>bilt</i>	140
3.2.2. <i>ybmt limm</i>	148
3.2.3. <i>rh̄m(y)</i>	153
3.3. The Baal Cycle (KTU 1.1-1.6).....	155
3.3.1. The Conflict of Baal and Yam	156
3.3.1.1. KTU 1.1.ii.15	156
3.3.1.2. KTU 1.2.i.40.....	157
3.3.2. The Palace of Baal	158
3.3.2.1. KTU 1.3.ii.2 - iii.2.....	158
3.3.2.2. KTU 1.3.iii.4 - 31.....	166
3.3.2.3. KTU 1.3.iii.32 - iv.4.....	171
3.3.2.4. KTU 1.3.iv.21 - 46.....	179
3.3.2.5. KTU 1.3.iv.53 - v.4.....	181
3.3.2.6. KTU 1.3.v.19 - 43.....	183
3.3.2.7. KTU 1.4.ii.21 - 26.....	187
3.3.2.8. KTU 1.4.iii.23 - 35.....	189
3.3.2.9. KTU 1.4.v.20 - 27.....	192
3.3.3. The Conflict of Baal and Mot.....	194
3.3.3.1. KTU 1.5.v.18 - 23.....	194
3.3.3.2. KTU 1.5.vi.11 - 1.6.i.31	197
3.3.3.3. KTU 1.6.i.39 - 43.....	203
3.3.3.4. KTU 1.6.ii.4 - 37.....	204
3.3.3.5. KTU 1.6.iii.22 - iv.24.....	208
3.4. The Aqhat Narrative (KTU 1.17-1.19).....	211
3.4.1. Anat's Attempt to Obtain Aqhat's Bow.....	213
3.4.1.1. KTU 1.17.vi.10 - 16.....	214
3.4.1.2. KTU 1.17.vi.16 - 45.....	217
3.4.2. Anat's threat to Aqhat.....	224
3.4.2.1. KTU 1.17.vi.41 - 45.....	224
3.4.3. Anat's Request to El	226
3.4.3.1. KTU 1.17.vi.50 - 52.....	226
3.4.3.2. KTU 1.18.i.6 - 19.....	227
3.4.4. The Plot to Murder Aqhat and its Execution	231
3.4.4.1. KTU 1.18.i.22 - 32.....	231
3.4.4.2. KTU 1.18.iv.1 - 27.....	235
3.4.4.3. KTU 1.18.iv.36 - 1.19.i.19	242
3.4.4.4. KTU 1.19.i.1 - 19.....	245
3.5. Conclusions.....	251
3.5.1. Anat in the Baal Cycle.....	251
3.5.2. Anat in the Aqhat Narrative.....	254

3.1. INTRODUCTION

Our richest source for understanding the character of Anat in the second millennium B.C. is without doubt the Ugaritic mythic narratives. Within the corpus of texts normally accepted as mythic narratives, as opposed to cultic lists, prayers, etc., are the grandiose myths ascribed to the hand of Ilmilku (*ilmk*),¹ namely the Baal cycle (*KTU* 1.1-1.6), Keret (*KTU* 1.14-16) and Aqhat (*KTU* 1.17-19). These form a convenient group of texts with which to begin our investigation. Anat appears as one of the principal characters in the Baal cycle and the Aqhat narrative, but is only alluded to in Keret. It is beyond the scope of this work to undertake a detailed analysis and reconstruction of the theologies of each of these narratives; many monographs have been dedicated to this task and many more will no doubt be written! Within the context of the present work, our analysis will be restricted in its scope, concentrating specifically on what we can learn about the character of the goddess Anat. I shall attempt to isolate relevant material from the narratives, and to restrict philological discussion to those areas of greatest interest to our objectives; I refer the reader to the many translations now available for analysis of these narratives as whole works. However, as a prelude to all this, I shall first direct attention to the three titles of Anat that have attracted most discussion in the scholarly literature.

3.2. TITLES

Before we examine the characterisation of Anat in Ugaritic myth, it would be instructive to survey the various titles she is given within the Ugaritic context. She

¹On the titles and office of Ilmilku see Dietrich and Loretz (1980b).

bears several different titles in the cultic texts such as *'nt ḥbly* 'Anat destroyer', *'nt ṣpn* 'Anat of Saphon' and *'nt ḥlš*, and I refer the reader to my discussion of these in my chapter on cultic texts (see below). In the mythic texts, there are three titles attributed to Anat which are important for understanding her character, and these are discussed in order of descending frequency.

3.2.1. *btlt*

The most familiar title of Anat is *btlt*, which is almost invariably followed by her personal name *'nt*. Only once do we find *btltm* without *'nt* following, where in 1.17.vi.34 Aqhat addresses Anat using the vocative (y) with this shortened form of Anat's full title. Perhaps the fact that this is part of his second, and most disparaging, rejection speech to Anat's two offers explains this shortened form; it is perhaps to be taken as a term of familiarity, in which case Aqhat is deliberately rejecting the accepted social differentiation between himself and the goddess, an attitude that is reflected in the tone of his speech.

There is no other goddess at Ugarit who bears the title *btlt*. A survey of the texts indicates that the full title *btlt 'nt* occurs eighteen times² leaving no doubt that *btlt* is applied to Anat. In a further 21 instances where the text is damaged, we can still be very confident that we should restore *btlt 'nt* in each case.³ This leaves us with a further eight cases which need closer scrutiny.

²The references are as follows: 1.3.iii.11, 1.3.v.29, 1.4.iii.24, 1.4.iv.18, 1.4.v.20, 1.4.v.25, 1.6.ii.14, 1.6.iii.22, 1.6.iv.6, 1.6.iv.21, 1.10.ii.15, 1.10.iii.2, 1.13.19, 1.18.iv.5, 1.18.iv.12, 1.18.iv.16, 1.19.ii.43, 1.101.15.

³The references are as follows: 1.3.ii.32, 1.3.iv.21, 1.3.v.19, 1.3.v.29, 1.4.ii.14, 1.4.ii.23, 1.4.iii.33, 1.4.iii.39, 1.6.iii.23, 1.10.i.1, 1.10.ii.10, 1.10.ii.21, 1.10.ii.26, 1.10.ii.35, 1.10.iii.9, 1.11.4, 1.11.7, 1.17.vi.25, 1.18.i.20, 1.18.iv.4, 1.19.i.5.

KTU 1.4.ii.38 reads *btlt*.[], but we can be fairly certain that the divine name 'nt follows. Line 37 reads *aliyn*.[], and the pairing of (Aliyan) Baal and (*btlt*) Anat is a recurrent theme in columns ii and iii of text four; cf. 4.ii.13f., 22f., 4.iii.23f., 37f. *KTU* 4.iv.18f. ends with the parting of Baal and Anat.

KTU 1.7.13 reads [*bt*]*l***t**[. 'nt]. Whilst there can be no doubt that text 1.7 is an alternative version to text 1.3.ii-iii, and that *KTU*'s assumption that we have the phrase *btlt*. 'nt is possible, the damage to the text at this point and the fact that there are only traces of two letters indicates that we should not accept this restoration without due caution.

KTU 1.7.25 can be restored *rgm.l***btlt*[*t*. 'nt] with some confidence since this appears to belong to a section that is paralleled in 1.3.iii.11-29. Compare the following two texts:

<i>KTU</i> 1.7.25-33	<i>KTU</i> 1.3.iii.11-29
25) <i>rgm l</i> * <i>btlt</i> [11) <i>w.rgm.l btlt</i> . 'nt
26) <i>hw</i> * <i>t</i> [12) <i>tny.l ymmt.limm</i>
27) [<i>b</i>] * <i>p</i> * <i>r</i> *[13) <i>thm.aliyn.b</i> ' <i>l.hwt</i>
28) <i>l</i> * <i>k</i> * <i>b</i> * <i>d</i> *. <i>s</i> *[14) <i>aliy.qrdm.qryy.b arş</i>
29) [<i>m</i>] <i>n</i> * * <i>m</i> * <i>y</i> * <i>tl</i> [15) <i>m</i> * <i>l</i> * <i>hmt</i> <i>št.b</i> 'pr <i>m.ddym</i>
30) <i>h</i> * <i>w</i> * <i>t</i> . <i>d at</i> *[16) <i>sk.šlm.l kbd.arş</i>
31) <i>w lhšt.abn</i> *[17) <i>arbdd.l kbd.šdm</i>
32) 'm <i>k</i> * <i>b</i> * <i>k</i> <i>bm</i> [18) <i>hšk. 'šk. 'bšk</i>
33) <i>w</i> * <i>an</i> * <i>k</i> . <i>i</i> * <i>b</i> *[19) 'my.p'nk.tlsmn. 'my
	20) <i>twth.išdk.dm.rgm</i>
	21) <i>it.ly.w.argmk</i>
	22) <i>hwt.w.atnyk.rgm</i>
	23) 'ş.w.lhšt.abn
	24) <i>tant.šmm. 'm.arş</i>
	25) <i>thmt. 'mn.kbkbm</i>
	26) <i>abn.brq.d l.td'.šmm</i>
	27) <i>rgm.l td'.nšm.w.l tbn</i>
	28) <i>hmlt.arş.atm.w ank</i>
	29) <i>ibğyh.b tk.ğry.il.spn</i>

Anat is mentioned by name in 1.7.37, which indicates that this text is a narrative concerning Anat; this also increases the possibility that it is Anat who is called *btlt*[*t*] in line 25.

KTU 1.10.i.14-15 reads [] **nt* || [] *l*imm*. In addition to the fact that *btlt* '*nt*' is often paralleled with *ybmt limm*,⁴ in 1.10.iii.2-3 we find the parallel *btlt.*'*nt* || *ybmt.lim**[*m*], which would seem to confirm the restoration of *btlt* here.

KTU 1.17.vi.34 reads *al.tš*r*gn.y btltm*. As we saw above, this is the direct speech of Aqhat, and there is no doubt that it is a vocative addressed to Anat. This appears to be the only confirmed instance of the lexeme *btlt* used as a title of Anat without being followed by the divine name itself.⁵

KTU 1.18.i.14 reads *w y'dr*k.b yd.btlt.*[]. It is clear from the context in which this line is spoken that *btlt* is a reference to Anat, and the fact that the right hand edge of this column is lost leaves enough room for the divine name '*nt*' to be restored. If we compare 1.18.i.20, which can be restored confidently as [*bt*]*lt.*'*nt*, then we have the second half of the phrase lost in 1.18.i, which supports the restoration of [*'nt*] in line 14.

KTU 1.18.i.22 reads ...*w šhq.btlt.*[]. Again we have a lacuna at the right hand edge of the column which raises the possibility of restoring the divine name '*nt*', and given what remains of the parallel colon, there seems little room for anything more adventurous. This phrase echoes that of 1.4.v.25 which reads, *šhq.btlt.*'*nt* as a parallel to the previous line 20 *šmh.btlt.*'*nt*. Therefore, there seems no reason to doubt that the goddess *btlt.*[] should be none other than Anat.

⁴Cf. *KTU* 1.3.ii.32, 1.10.iii.2, 1.10i.15, and possibly in 1.3.iv.21, 1.4.ii.14.

⁵*KTU* 1.4.ii.38, 1.18.i.14 and 22 lack the divine name, but in these cases, the lexeme *btlt* is immediately followed by a lacuna in which '*nt*' is probably to be restored.

We have now covered every occurrence of *btlt*, with one important exception, and all the evidence suggests that *btlt* is always used as an epithet of Anat and that the usual form of the title is *btlt 'nt*, except in 1.17.vi.34 where a shortened (possibly less respectful?) vocative *ybtltm* is used by Aqhat. We now turn our attention to 1.15.ii.27.

In lines 25-28 we find the following text,

25) <i>lk. tld*. ys*b*[.] ḡ*l*m*</i>	...she will bear the lad <i>ysb</i>
26) <i>ynq. ḥ*l*b. a*[t]rt</i>	He will suck milk of Athirat
27) <i>mšš. tld*. b*tl[t.]</i>	He will drain the breast of <i>btlt</i> ...
28) <i>m*šnq*[]</i>	Wet nurse/suckling (?) ...

Although the majority of scholars have restored the divine name '*nt* in the lacuna after *btlt* in line 27, Løkkegaard (1956) made the observation that in the Old Testament, wet nurses were always subordinate women which thus ruled out Athirat and Anat as possible candidates for being wet nurses of the king's son. He writes,

The youngest of the Kotharot, Miqat, is beyond doubt the proper wet nurse of the gods, not Astarte, nor Anat. The latter in her recklessness and ferocity is the very picture of emancipated womanhood, a very questionable wet nurse with very small hope for the child's survival.

Leaving to one side his contentious assertion that "recklessness and ferocity" is an expression of emancipated womanhood, it should be noted that Løkkegaard substantiated his thesis by reading <k>*trt* at the end of line 26. However, examination of a colour slide of this tablet shows that the reading of *KTU* is to be preferred, and that an initial *k* cannot be supported. Furthermore, Løkkegaard's assumption that major goddesses of the ancient Near East would not suckle kings flies in the face of evidence from contemporary Egypt, where there are many examples of kings being nursed by various goddesses, including Anat (see my chapter on the Egyptian evidence for Anat).

A serious challenge to the restoration of *'nt* at the end of line 27 comes from Wyatt (1976 and 1983) who suggests (1976 417 n.33) that we should restore *atrt* or *rhmy*, "where *Athirat* or *Šapš* are meant".⁶ His objection lies in the pairing of the goddesses *Athirat* and *Anat* who, according to Ugaritic cosmology, belong to two different generations of deities. Far better, in Wyatt's opinion, is either a dual reference to *Athirat*, or the pairing of *Athirat* and *Shapshu* who are originally a gemination of the morning and evening sun, married to the moon-god *El* and who became mothers of the twin forms of *Venus* (1987a 339).

Wyatt's assessment of the character of *Athirat* is based in some respects on his analysis of her position in the pre-Islamic South Arabian pantheon structure. Earlier work by Nielsen (1927) portrayed it as consisting of a divine triad of Moon-god, Sun-goddess, and Venus-son; *Athirat*'s place among this triad was as the sun-goddess. However, recent scholarship has reassessed the evidence and now believes that although some form of divine triad can be predicated for South Arabian religion, other divinities stand outside this scheme (Jamme 1947; Ryckmans 1988 and 1989). Wiggins (1993 153f.) remains open to the possibility that the South Arabian *Athirat* was perceived as a solar goddess, although in his conclusion (163f.) he stresses the wide temporal and geographical separation of Ugaritic and ESA cultures.⁷ It thus seems inappropriate to draw too heavily upon ESA theology in order to elucidate the earliest history of an Ugaritic goddess such as *Athirat*.

⁶Wyatt (1983 273 n.9) proposes two further possibilities, *špš* and *rbt*, if his former suggestion of *atrt* or *rhmy* be considered too long for the lacuna. However, looking at a colour slide of the tablet, I would consider there to be enough space to accommodate any of these suggestions.

⁷ESA inscriptions date to around the middle of the first millennium B.C. which allows for at least a thousand years of local development in *Athirat*'s characterisation!

Returning to Wyatt's interpretation of 1.15.ii.27, I would hesitate to restore *btlt*.[*špš*] (or his other suggestions) when the overwhelming evidence from Ugaritic texts points to the fixed title *btlt* 'nt. The fact that every other occurrence of the lexeme *btlt* is a title of the goddess Anat (*contra* Kapelrud 1969 28) must not be ignored. This does not rule out the *possibility* that we could restore the name of another goddess; however, given the weight of evidence, I feel that we should have much stronger reasons to abandon the obvious correlation between this particular epithet and the goddess Anat than on the basis of text 1.23 which portrays Athirat and *rhmy* as royal mothers (Wyatt 1987a).

The pairing of Athirat with Anat may not be as problematical as Wyatt suggests. Indeed, he points out (1984 331) the 'problem' of Keret's bride-to-be being compared to Anat when the ideology of hierogamy would suggest that a comparison with Athirat would be more appropriate. In the present text, it is an exceptional pairing; the normal poetic parallel to Anat is the goddess Astarte, both at Ugarit and in Egypt. We know that Anat nursed the Egyptian king and was his 'mother' whilst he was her 'son' (see above), although I do not advocate using Egyptian evidence to undertake a reconstruction of a little-understood aspect of Ugaritic Anat. It is very probable that Anat's role as mother to the king in Egypt was a result of *Egyptian* theology, although this does not rule out the possibility that she had a similar function in Canaanite theology. Evidence for this role may come in text 1.13.31f. where we are told that Anat's breast 'knew its sucking' after she had given birth to her (male) child (*šgr*), although this text is difficult to interpret and this particular understanding of the text is disputed by some scholars (e.g. Walls 1992).⁸

⁸For my defence of this interpretation of text 1.13 see my discussion below.

Returning to the present passage, if we are to restore Anat into the lacuna, then the image of Yassib suckled by Athirat and Anat is symbolic of his position as royal heir within the narrative; Athirat is the mother of the gods but Anat too is a mother to Baal's offspring, and hence both goddesses have the symbolic potential to be mother of the royal heir.

Many scholars have taken *btlt* to mean 'virgin' in the sense of a woman who has never engaged in sexual intercourse. Within Ugaritic itself *btlt* appears only as a title of Anat which means we have no further contexts in which to analyse this term. However, recent analysis of this lexeme in the wider context of the ancient Near East has given rise to the notion that *btlt* is really to be understood as a term denoting the social status of a young girl rather than as determining her sexual experience. Bowman (1978 169f.) has undertaken a comprehensive study of this term in its Akkadian, Hebrew, Syriac and Arabian contexts. For Akkadian, the terms *batūlu* and *batultu* are to be understood as 'young adolescent boy' and 'young adolescent girl' respectively (CAD 2.173f.). For *batultu* CAD (2.174) concludes, "The word primarily denotes an age group; only in specific contexts such as the cited section of the Assyrian code and in NB marriage contracts does it assume the connotation 'virgin'." However, this opinion has been challenged by Finkelstein (1966 356, 357 n.3) who asserts that Neo-Babylonian *batultu* does not carry the connotation of 'virgin', *contra* CAD, but simply denotes an age status. It is important to note that the status of *batūlu* / *batultu* does not preclude the possibility of engaging in sexual intercourse. It seems that whenever a 'virgin', in its English sense of never having engaged in sexual intercourse, is intended by the lexeme *batultu* it was necessary to add an explanatory clause to this effect.

Similar claims have been made for hb. בְּתוּלָה (e.g. Wenham 1972, PLMU 125f., Locher 1986) and other cognate languages (see the summary of Bowman 1978 173f.) and the general conclusion is that there is no Semitic lexeme that denotes a

woman who has not had sexual intercourse (i.e. a *virgo intacta*, UT 19.540) but that *blt* is a designation of a young girl with a particular social standing (Bowman 1978 174, Day 1991 144f., Walls 1992 154f.). Day (1991 145) argues that *blt* designates a girl between her first menarche, i.e. having the potential to bear children, and the birth of her first child; applying this category to the goddess Anat, she concludes that Anat perpetually remains in this category, “suspended... at this crucial point in time where male and female are becoming differentiated”. Anat is an eternal adolescent whose ambivalent gender allows her to move freely between male and female spheres.⁹ This explains why she is a hunter and a warrior, which are activities normally restricted to males.

However, my interpretation of the Ugaritic material is in fundamental disagreement with the opinion that Anat was not sexually active. While I feel we should be more cautious in our enthusiasm to see Anat engaged in the sexual act, there is strong evidence from texts 1.10, 11, and 13 to suggest that Anat and Baal mate, and that Anat has offspring (*contra* Day 1991, 1992, Walls 1992). There is no reason to suggest, with de Moor (e.g. *ARTU*), that Anat was sexually active but that she was unable to give birth, which allows her to retain the status of a *blt*, since the texts depict her giving birth and declaring the news to Baal (cf. 1.10.iii.32f., 1.13.29f.).¹⁰ In other words, despite the cognate evidence supporting a meaning of

⁹This is an almost identical analysis to that of Walls (1992 throughout).

¹⁰De Moor’s position within *ARTU* is rather ambiguous; discussing text 1.13 he states that Anat is in anguish because Baal was not able to penetrate her (138 n.10) and translates lines 32f “*[the sl]i[t of her orifice] was not one he could open || his ‘hand’ [found it (?)] too small*”. Discussing text 1.10.iii he states that Anat was unable to bear offspring so she proposed to enter a cow “so that the cow would be able to bear offspring for her”. This is not the same as being unable to engage in sexual intercourse. However, in discussing the title *blt* (7 n.33) he states that the translation of *blt* by ‘Virgin’ was inaccurate “since Anatu did have some sort of intercourse with her husband”. The confusion is increased by his referring the reader to his notes on text 1.13 where he has already stated that Baal could not penetrate her! An appeal to the Egyptian text Harris Magical Papyrus which tells us that Egyptian Anat and Astarte were unable to give birth is

'Maiden' or some other English equivalent depicting a young woman between her first menarche and parturition, Anat is depicted in the Ugaritic myths as a sexually active, and procreative, goddess. I would not go so far as to call her a goddess of love; she simply enjoys a healthy sexual role within the myths. This incongruity between her title *btlt* and her actions described in the myths is surprising, but is the kind of ambivalence often held together in tension within religious thought; Anat is at once a nubile young girl who is sexually attractive (cf. Keret's comparison of his young bride to Anat and Astarte), and a sexually active woman with procreative powers.

3.2.2. *ybmt limm*

The length of the discussion on the title *btlt* above is a reflection of the importance of this title for Anat seen in the frequency of its application to this goddess and in the fact that it is never used with any other goddess. Much less frequent¹¹ is the title *ybmt limm*, which is found often in parallel with *btlt 'nt* but never in parallel with any other deity. Many attempts have been made to provide a satisfactory etymology and meaning to this title, but the results are less than satisfactory. We need only compare translations such as 'Progenitress of the Peoples' (Albright 1938 19 n.6), 'Mother of the Nations' (Cassuto 1971 65), 'Sister-in-law of the Nations' (van Selms

misleading since it deals with a peculiarly *Egyptian* myth centred around the conflict between Horus and Seth (see above).

¹¹The references are as follows: *ybmt limm* 1.3.ii.33, *ybmt [limm]* 1.4.ii.15-16, *ybmt lim*[m]* 1.10.iii.3, *ybmt li*m*m* 1.17.vi.19, *ybmt limm* 1.17.vi.25, and *ymmt limm* 1.3.iii.12. Uncertain forms are *y*[bmt]* *l*imm** 1.3.iv.22, *[ybmt]* *l*imm* 1.10.i.15, and *[ybmt]* *limm* 1.101.15-16. In 1.13.19-20 we find *tb[] limm* in parallel to *btlt 'nt**, which suggests we should restore *y!b[mt]* *limm*. In 1.13.22-23 we find the bicolon *s*m*k l*arh || w bn [] limm*. What is needed is a vocative title as a parallel to *arh* 'cow'. In my discussion of text 1.13 (below) I conclude that we are justified to restore *[ybmt]* to give the usual title of Anat.

1954 70, Oldenburg 1969 88), 'Nubile Widow of the Limites' (de Moor 1969 183), 'Sister of the Mighty One' (Gray 1979 319 n.28), 'The Wanton Widow of the Nations' (de Moor 1980 308f., *ARTU*), 'Dove of Lim' (Wyatt 1992 418), to see that there is a great diversity of opinion in our understanding of this phrase.

Bowman gives a clear account of the problem and a history of interpretation down to 1978 (186f.), and this has been brought up to date by the excellent study of Walls (1992 94-107), and there is no need to repeat their work in the present study. However, I shall present a review of the problems faced in interpreting this title and refer the reader to the above two studies for detailed studies.

The problem can be divided into an interpretation of *ybm̄t* / *ym̄mt* on the one hand, and of *limm* on the other, both of which harbour many difficulties. The first note to make is that *ym̄mt* occurs only once, whilst the other occurrences attest an orthography of *ybm̄t*. Albright (1938 19 n.6) states that *ybm̄t* is a dissimilated form from an original *ym̄mt* which he derives from a Semitic root **yāmām* 'progenitor' which he believes then developed the meaning of 'husband's brother'. Also claiming that *ym̄mt* is the primary form are Obermann (1948 35f.) and Wyatt (1992 418), although the latter suggests a different etymology, linking *ym̄mt* with ar. *yamamat* 'pigeon, dove'.¹² Wyatt (1992 417) writes of the two forms,

While the spelling *ybm̄t* has the strongest support, it hardly has a monopoly, and so close are *b* and *m* phonetically (plosive and fricative forms of the same voiced labial articulation) that we may credit either a scribal mishearing on one or more instances, if the texts were dictated, or an etymological equivalence of two terms, to be seen as variants of each other.

¹²Following a suggestion of Løkkegaard in *Studia orientalia J. Pedersen dicata*, Copenhagen 1953, p.226. Compare the summary of *TOu1* (90f. and 91 n.1) who mentions Sarna's (1957 24) observation that the name of Job's daughter (Job 42.14) 𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓 may correspond to Ugaritic *ym̄mt* (cf. *UT* 19.1065).

There is good evidence for a *b/m* interchange in Ugaritic (Cutler and Macdonald 1973 69f.), but given the relative frequencies of *ybm̄t* and *ym̄mt*, it seems likely that any scribal mishearing would have been from *ybm̄t* to *ym̄mt*, which suggests a primary form *ybm̄t*. The alternative is to see the two forms as the result of phonetic variation, but again, the fact that *ym̄mt* occurs only once suggests that *ybm̄t* was the dominant form, although it could be argued that a dominant form is not necessarily an original form. It is very difficult to decide from such a small sample what the relationship between these two forms might be; they could either be the result of a misspelling or mishearing (Bowman 1978 187) or *ym̄mt* could be a phonetic derivation of *ybm̄t*. The supposition that *ybm̄t* is a derivative of *ym̄mt* seems less likely, but not impossible.

Given that the most likely basic form is from a root **ybm̄*, Walls (1992 94f.) presents a detailed discussion of the many attempts to understand *ybm̄t* with reference to various Semitic cognates. After a detailed review, he concludes (107) that the most promising cognate is hb. *בִּם and that “the kinship connotation of this appellative appears to be the most correct”. This in itself is not troublesome since the deities of the Ugaritic pantheon, like their human devotees, were bound in a web of kinship bonds, and the evidence from Ugaritic onomastics show us that kinship terminology was used to describe the relationship between the bearer of the name and the goddess (see my discussion on Ugaritic personal names above). Huffmon (1965 205f.) demonstrates that apart from the common terms of *'b* ‘father’ and *'m* ‘mother’ we find in Amorite onomastics less straightforward kinship terminology to express human-divine relations; **ḥālu* ‘maternal uncle’ and *ḥatnu* ‘son-in-law’ are applied to the relationship between devotee and Dagan or Shamash, for example. In fact at Mari (ARM 7.184.4') we find the personal name *ḥa!-mi-ḥa-na-at* ‘kinsman of Anat’ (see above). All of these examples demonstrate that gods and humans can be thought to share a kinship relationship which is not always as straightforward as ‘mother’ or

'father', and therefore that we cannot object to Anat having a title that predicates a kinship relationship between her and humanity.

As for the second term *limm*, there are at least as many suggestions for the meaning of this lexeme as there are for *ybmt*. Craigie (1978 377) points to 1.13.20 where we find *limm* as a parallel to *btlt 'nt* as evidence for *limm* as a name for Anat. He also states that the theophorous element *lim* we find in *KTU* 1.102.22 is unrelated to *limm* (377 n.19) although he gives no reason; Bowman (1978 189) also distinguishes between *lim* and the longer form *limm*. However, as I argue below, in text 1.13 we can justifiably restore *y!b[mt]* which weakens his arguments. The fact that *lim* occurs in 1.3.ii.7 as a parallel to *adm* 'men' and *hmlt* 'multitude'¹³ has prompted many to take *limm* as a designation for 'peoples'. Alternatively, *limm* is seen as a designation of Baal (de Moor 1969 183, Bowman 1978, Wyatt 1992 417) and Anat's close association with Baal in the mythic texts is appealed to as support for this position. This suggestion relies on the fact that we find a divine name Lim at Mari, but the identity of this deity is unclear, and has been variously identified with Adad (Bowman 1978 192), Dagan (Dossin 1950 41f., de Moor 1969 183, Wyatt 1992 417) or Shamash (Lipinski 1967). However, Akkadian *limu* is often used in personal names without the semantic classifier DINGIR as a collective reference to the 'thousand gods' (Huffmon 1965 226, Bowman 1978 191, Walls 1992 98) worshipped at Mari and it is not clear exactly what status was enjoyed by this divinity.

If we accept that Lim was a major deity at Mari, then we are still faced with the problem of whether we can relate this to the *limm* of Anat's title. There are many uncertainties to be dealt with, not least of which is whether the god Lim was

¹³Wyatt (1992 412) has recently proposed that *hmlt* should be taken as a title of Baal cognate with akk. *ummilu* and meaning 'Tempest'. However, this does not change the fact that *lim* is in parallel with *adm* in text 1.3.ii.

known at Ugarit. The occurrence of the personal name *yrgb lim* in 1.102.22 helps very little since it occurs in a list of personal names on the opposite face of the tablet to a list of divine names (see below) in an obscure context; scholars are uncertain as to the relationship between these two lists and even whether these names are native to Ugarit or not (de Moor 1970 326, Dietrich *et al.* 1975c, *TRU* 329, Walls 1992 99). There is very little evidence elsewhere from Ugarit to suggest that there was a deity Lim known at Ugarit (see the discussion of Bowman 1978 and Walls 1992), which makes an equation of Baal with Lim as an explanation for Anat's title as *ybmt* of Lim (= Baal) contentious. Bowman (1978 192) circumvents the difficulty of making this equation by suggesting that *ybmt limm* was a title of Anat at Mari which was reinterpreted by later Ugaritic theologians as a kinship term relating her to Baal. Whilst we are well aware of Anat's presence at Mari, we find no evidence suggestive of a relationship between Anat and Lim (see above). Bowman's suggestion is a possibility, but has no verification from any of the literary remains found so far from Mari.

As we can see from this brief survey of recent opinion, the interpretation of Anat's title *yb/mmt limm* is still highly contentious. The evidence points some way to see in *ybmt* some kind of kinship term, but its relationship to the following *limm* is difficult to interpret, since we are unsure whether *limm* should refer to the human population (*lim* || *adm*), to a deity Lim whose presence at Ugarit is uncertain, to Baal as a god of the storm, or to some other root (see Walls 1992 for other suggestions). Given our uncertain state of knowledge on this title at present, it seems wise to reserve judgement until further information becomes available; in the following discussion I leave it untranslated.

3.2.3. *rhm(y)*

The equation is often made between Anat and the goddess *rḥmy* who appears in text 1.23 alongside Athirat, and in 1.15.ii.6 where she appears alongside *ršp zbl* ‘Prince Reshef’ as one of the guests at the banquet celebrating the wedding of Keret to Huray (accepted by *inter alia* Oldenburg 1969 88, *CML2* 90 n.4, 123 n.10, Bowman 1978 183f., *ARTU* 117f.; rejected by *inter alia* *TOuI* 89, Walls 1992 82).

The only certain reference which links Anat to the lexeme *rhm* occurs in 1.6.ii.27f. which is a description of Anat’s longing for Baal. Here we find the following text,

<i>rhm</i> . ‘ <i>nt</i> . <i>tngth</i>	The girl Anat sought him.
28) <i>k lb</i> . <i>arḥ</i> . <i>l</i> ‘ <i>glh</i> .	Like the heart of a cow for its calf,
<i>k lb</i> 29) <i>tat</i> . <i>l imrh</i> .	like the heart of a ewe for its lamb,
<i>km</i> . <i>lb</i> 30) ‘ <i>nt</i> . <i>atr</i> . <i>b’l</i> .	was like the heart of Anat after Baal.

It is possible that we should relate ug. *rhm* to hb. רֶחֶם ‘womb’ which seems to have developed the meaning ‘girl’ (e.g. Jud 5.30, Mesha inscription *KAI* 181.17). Ugaritic *rhm* may also have the meaning ‘compassion’ used of Keret’s daughter (cf. *KTU* 1.16.i.33 *krḥmt*). The difficulty with the phrase *rhm* ‘*nt* in the above text is that if it were an adjective qualifying Anat, we would expect the feminine ending *-t*. A solution which takes *rhm* in construct with the divine name, ‘the womb of Anat’ seems promising as a suitable parallel to the following simile of the heart (*lb*) of the cow and the ewe yearning for their young. However, it may be the case that lines 28-30 form a tricolon ending with the *lb* of Anat yearning after Baal and that line 27 should be kept separate from this tricolon. More importantly, the verb (*tngth*) has the feminine prefix whilst the noun *rhm* is masculine.¹⁴

¹⁴I am indebted to Prof. J.C.L. Gibson for pointing this out to me.

Given the grammatical difficulties with the above suggestions, I have chosen to translate the phrase *rḥm* 'nt by 'The girl Anat' placing the noun and the divine name in apposition, although this is uncertain. However, the use of this particular noun qualifying Anat at this point seems apposite to the pathos of the narrative; her treatment of Mot demonstrates the strength of her passion. Also, I find no objection in seeing this title as an allusion to Anat as a goddess with a functioning womb (*contra* Walls 1992 81f.) since Anat bears offspring to Baal, a fact that may well have influenced the following simile.

There is very little to suggest that *rḥmy* should be equated with Anat. Bowman's (1978 184) assertion that Anat and Reshef are closely associated in the offering texts is an overstatement of the evidence (see my chapter below) and to equate Anat with *rḥmy* in 1.15.ii.6 on this basis cannot be sustained. Similarly, there is no reason to equate *rḥmy* of text 1.23 with Anat since we never find her elsewhere qualified by the title *rḥmy*. Although present opinion favours taking *atrt wṛḥmy* as two separate goddesses (see now Wiggins 1993 74f.), the divine name Anat does not appear in text 1.23, which raises the question of why all the other deities in the text appear with their familiar names and yet Anat has been systematically renamed *rḥmy*. From the above discussion it is clear that Anat was qualified by *rḥm* (girl) on this specific occasion when she is depicted in the narrative as despairing over the loss of Baal; the use of the noun *rḥm* at this point introduces us to the side of Anat's nature that is often overlooked, the fact that she is a female with a passion for her lover as strong as the bond between mother and child, an image reinforced by the choice of the noun *rḥm* which encompasses the complex of ideas of femininity, compassion, fertility, etc. However, there is little to support the view that the title *rḥmy* was applied to Anat, and the generality of this title is such that it does not point unequivocally to Anat as its bearer.

3.3. THE BAAL CYCLE (*KTU* 1.1-1.6)

The Baal cycle divides into three major themes: the conflict of Baal and Yam, Baal's palace, and the conflict of Baal and Mot.¹⁵ The debate concerning the arrangement and order of the tablets within the Baal cycle is beyond the scope of this work, but see the useful synopsis of del Olmo Lete (*MLC* 81f.) and the table he presents (83); for the purposes of our discussion I shall follow the position which maintains the order of *KTU* 1.1-1.6 as the best overall explanation of many of the features of these tablets.¹⁶ Anat plays a significant role only in the latter two themes; in the theme of Baal's palace she is introduced as a warrior goddess who attempts to obtain permission from El for Baal to begin construction of his palace, whilst in that of Baal and Mot, she appears as a goddess who is devastated by the death of Baal, who searches for his body at the interface between life and death, who gives Baal a proper burial, and who acts positively to restore him to life.

¹⁵Cf. del Olmo Lete (1977 31). For a highly provocative and original analysis of the Baal cycle as symbolic of Baal's struggles against his incestuous acts and motives see Starr (1984). For the discussion of a possible Indo-European background to the Baal versus Yam theme see Wyatt (1988), and for a discussion of a version of this theme from Mari see Bordreuil and Pardee (1993 69f.).

¹⁶For a recent defence of this position and a critical attack on the position of de Moor (e.g. in *SP* and *ARTU*) see Grabbe (1976), Gibson (1984 204f.). Smith (1986 324f.) reviews the arguments for and against accepting the sequence *KTU* 1.1-1.6. He concludes that "the Baal cycle as a whole may be viewed as a piece with a single symmetry: the palace of Baal, the crowning symbol of royal status flanked on either side by a struggle over Baal's kingship" (328). For Smith, the theme of Baal's kingship provides the best interpretational framework.

3.3.1. The Conflict of Baal and Yam

3.3.1.1. *KTU* 1.1.ii.15

The lexeme *'nt* appears in the very broken text *KTU* 1.1.ii.15.¹⁷ There are two good reasons to accept this as the name of the goddess Anat: firstly, lines 15f. appear to match *KTU* 1.3.iii.9f. where we find that messengers of Baal have come to Anat, and secondly, in line 14 we find a possible mention of Anat's residence *ji*n.bb.* (*inbb*: cf. 1.3.iv.34, 1.13.9, 1.100.20). The sender of the message appears in this text to be El, since in line 18 we find *ltpn.htkk* which can be translated as 'the Compassionate, your sire' (cf. 1.6.iv.11). De Moor (*ARTU* 20) understands this passage, within his overall scheme of the Baal cycle, as a description of events after Anat has obtained permission from El for Baal to build his palace (text 1.3). He argues that in a large lacuna we should find that the continual harassment of other gods, who are jealous of Baal's ambitious building plans, has provoked Anat to complain to El about their interruptions; El then promises to help Anat and asks her to come to him with a list of necessary building materials. However, I find it difficult to accept de Moor's theory which reads so much into this very fragmentary text, and which depends on an arrangement of tablets that seems to be based more on what is missing from them rather on what remains. Rather than accepting de Moor's optimistic analysis of this text, I think we have to accept that it is broken to such an extent that we cannot be certain of its narrative content. Therefore, I present text 1.1.ii simply as a possible mention of Anat and her relationship with El, without attempting further to interpret such a damaged text.

¹⁷For a discussion of this tablet and its place or otherwise in the Baal cycle, see *inter alia* *TOu1* (293-298) who view this tablet as a synopsis of the Baal cycle (*CML2* 3), and *MLC* (81f.) who follows the traditional ordering of *CTA*.

3.3.1.2. *KTU 1.2.i.40*

Another possible reference to Anat may be restored in text 1.2.i.40 where we find,]n*t.tuḥd.šmalh.tuḥd. 'ttrt. If we restore [ymnh. '] in the preceding lacuna we then have the bicolon,

Anat seized his right hand,

Astarte seized his left hand.

This occurs in the context of Baal's reaction to the demands of Yam. The parallelism of Anat with Astarte is not uncommon at Ugarit and, as we have seen from the Egyptian evidence, is also a motif found outside the thought-world of Ugaritic myth. However, even if we are to restore her name here, it is apparent that Anat plays only a very minor role in this part of the Baal cycle. In column iv of this tablet we find Baal engaged in combat against Yam, whom he defeats with the aid of magic clubs supplied by Kothar. After the collapse of Yam we find Astarte urging Baal to humiliate Yam, but we find no parallel episode involving Anat and Baal here, unless we assume that her name was lost in the fragmentary text at the end of the column, possibly as the subject of the verb *t'n* in line 35. However, there is no evidence to support this, and it would be misleading to introduce Anat into a scene simply on the basis that Astarte is involved. Thus it seems that in the theme of the struggle between Baal and Yam, Anat has no role to play, at least not in the version preserved on tablet 2, beyond a rather stereotypical pairing of Anat and Astarte involved in the twofold action of restraining the left and right hands of Baal. This has similarities with the reference to Anat and Astarte as the 'hands' of Pharaoh's chariot in the Rhind ostrakon (see above), and although I am not suggesting any literary connection, it does seem as if the duality of this divine pair and the duality of 'hands' could lead to the use of similar imagery across international borders.

3.3.2. The Palace of Baal

3.3.2.1. KTU 1.3.ii.2 - iii.2

Our first detailed introduction to the character of Anat within the Baal cycle comes in the second column of text 1.3 where we witness Anat slaughtering opponents in a relentless and ferocious manner.¹⁸

2) <i>kpr. šb'. bnt.</i>	Perfume ¹⁹ of seven daughters,
<i>rh. gdm 3) w anhbm.</i>	scent of coriander and murex.
<i>klāt. tgrt 4) bht 'nt.</i>	Anat closed the gates of the mansion,
<i>w tqry. glmm 5) b št. gr.</i>	and met the servants at the foot of the mountain.
<i>w hln. 'nt. tm 6) thš. b 'mq.</i>	And behold! Anat fought in the vale, ²⁰
<i>thšb. bn 7) qrytm</i>	she slaughtered between ²¹ the two cities.
<i>tmhš. lim. hp y*[m]</i>	She smote the people of the sunset, ²²
8) <i>tšmt. adm. šat. šp*š</i>	she destroyed the men of the sunrise.
9) <i>thth. k kdrt. ri[š]</i>	Under her, like balls, ²³ were heads,
10) <i>'lh. k irbym. kp.</i>	above her, ²⁴ like locusts, were palms,

¹⁸For a comparison of 1.3.ii-iii with the parallel text 1.7 see Dijkstra (1983).

¹⁹Taking this as a noun 'scent, perfume' || *rh* (de Moor 1986 220f.), but it could also be a D-stem 'to perfume' cf. akk. *kapāru* (MLC 568).

²⁰Cf. hb. כָּוֶה 'vale' (e.g. SP 90) rather than 'with strength' cf. akk. *emūqu* 'strength, violence' (Cassuto 1971 115).

²¹The phrase *bn qrytm* could mean 'the sons of the two cities' (e.g. Kapelrud 1969 49, Cassuto 1971 87), but the verb is reflexive and intransitive, and I take *bn* as a preposition parallel to *b-* of the previous colon (e.g. CML 85, SP 90, TOu1 393, CML2 47, Gray 1979 317, etc.).

²²This is a translation suggested to me by Prof. J.C.L. Gibson who refers to hb. חָפַף giving 'covering of the day' as an antithetical parallel to the 'coming forth of the sun'. Many scholars take *hp* as cognate with hb. חָפַף 'shore, coast' (e.g. CML 85, Cassuto 1971 116, TOu1 158 n.i, Gray 1979 317 n.12, MLC 553, ARTU 5), but CML2 objects that the ar. equivalent is *ḥaffatu*.

²³Cf. hb. כָּדֹר 'ball' in Is. 22.18, (Cassuto 1971 116, CML2 47, MLC 564). SP (90) suggests 'lump of earth' cf. ar. *kadrah* (Oldenburg 1969 87, Walls 1992 163), but I think the shape of decapitated heads leads one to translate 'like balls' rather than the more amorphous 'lumps of earth'. Hardly 'vultures' (UT 19.1201, Kapelrud 1969 49, Gordon 1977 77).

²⁴ARTU (5) translates 'on her', and although this is a possibility, I believe the antithetical parallelism with *tht* points to the hands being *over* her, as the simile suggests, like a swarm of locusts which fills the air.

*k. qšm** 11) *ḡrmn**. *kp. mhr.*
 'tkt 12) *rišt. l* bmth.*
šnst 13) *kpt. b ḥb*šh.*
brkm. tḡl[l]* 14) *b dm. dmr.*
*ḥlqm. b mm** 15) *mhrm.*
mṯm. tgrš 16) *šbm.*
b ksl. qšth. mdnt
 17) *w ḥln. 'nt. l bth. tmḡyn*
 18) *tštql. ilt. l ḥklh*
 19) *w l. šb't. tmṯṣh. b 'mq*
 20) *tḥtšb. bn. qrtm.*
tt'r 21) *ksat. l mhr.*
t'r. tlḥnt 22) *l šbim.*
hdmm. l ḡzrm
 23) *mid. tmṯṣn. w t'n*
 24) *tḥtšb. w tḥdy. 'nt*
 25) *tḡ*d*d. kbdh. b šḥq.*

like destructive²⁵ grasshoppers were palms of warriors.
 She fastened heads to her back,
 she tied palms to her belt.
 She plunged her knees into the blood of guards,
 her thighs²⁶ into the gore of warriors.
 With arrows²⁷ she drove out the captives,
 by the string²⁸ of her bow the survivors.²⁹
 And behold, Anat reached her house,
 the goddess arrived at her palace.
 But she was not sated with her fight in the valley,
 with her slaughter between the two cities.
 She arranged seats for the warriors,
 arranged tables for the armies,
 footstools for the heroes.
 Savagely she fought and looked,
 Anat slaughtered and gazed around.³⁰
 Her liver swelled with laughter,

²⁵Literally 'Grasshoppers of destruction' cf. ar. *ḡarāmu* (e.g. *SP* 90, *CML* 2 47). Although the suggestion of *MLC* (608) of 'enjambre' [swarm] cf. hb. עֲרָבָה 'heap', ar. 'aramah, is attractive, it is phonetically difficult (cf. also *TOu* 1 159 'fragments d'une gerbe'). *ARTU* (5) loses the evident parallelism of *irbym* || *qšm* (cf. ar. *qašām* 'locust') by translating 'like scales of a plane-tree the hands of the warriors', taking *qšm* with a root *qšš* or *qšm* 'cut off' referring to the appearance of the scaly bark of the plane-tree, and *ḡrmn* with hb. עֲרָבָה 'plane-tree', although this appears to be a derivation from hb. עֲרָבָה II cognate to ar. 'arama.

²⁶The noun *ḥlqm* must refer to an anatomical feature and is probably dual because of its parallelism with *brkm* (e.g. *SP*, Dietrich and Loretz 1972 30, Gray 1979, *MLC*). *TOu* 1 (159) translates 'les pans de sa jupe' cf. Mishnaic hb. *ḥālūq*, and *CML*(2) has 'skirts' cf. hb. קְלָיִת, ar. *miḥlaqu*. De Moor (*SP* 92 and *ARTU* 6) believes it comes from the root *ḥlq* 'be smooth' referring to her 'smooth buttocks' cf. hb. קְלָיִת ar. *halaqa*, (cf. Kapelrud 1969 49 'seat' but with no etymology) and is followed by Gray (1979 318 n.19) who glosses 'smooth thighs' (so also Cassuto 1971 118, Wyatt [unpubl. transl.] 'thighs'). *MLC* suggests 'los miembros'.

²⁷A poetic designation from *mṯ* 'rod, staff' cf. hb. מִטָּה in Hb. 3.9, 14 (e.g. *SP* 92, *CML* 2 47, *MLC* 181), as a parallel to 'string of her bow', rather than 'stave, rod' (e.g. *TOu* 1 159).

²⁸Cf. ar. *kisl* (e.g. Renfroe 1992 124), rather than 'stave' (e.g. *ARTU* 6).

²⁹Taking *šbm* as 'captive' cf. hb. שְׁבוּי 'captive'; its parallel *mdnt* cf. hb. מְדִינָה, ar. *madīnatu* means something like 'city, town' and as a parallel to 'captive' perhaps relates to those surviving in the town.

³⁰This could also mean 'she rejoiced' (from *ḥdy* cf. hb. חָדַת II, akk. *ḥadû*) anticipating the next tricolon, but in view of the parallelism with the verb 'yn 'see, look at' it compared with hb. רָאָה 'see'.

ymlu 26) lbh. b šmḥt.
 kbd. 'nt 27) tšyt.
 k brkm. tḡll. b dm 28) dmr.
 ḥlqm. b mm'. mhrm
 29) 'd. tšb'. tmḥš. b bt
 30) tḥtšb. bn. tlḥnm.
 ymh 31) b* dt (bt). dm. dmr.
 yšq. šmn 32) šlm. b š'.
 trḥš. ydh. bt 33) [l]t. 'nt.
 ušb'th. ybmt. limm.
 34) [t]r*h*š*. ydh. b dm. dmr
 35) [u]šb'th. b mm'. mhrm
 36) [t] *r*. ksāt. l ksāt.
 tlḥnt 37) b* tlḥn (tlḥnt).
 hdmm. ttar. l hdmm
 38) t*hšpn. mh. w trḥš
 39) t*l. šmm. šmn. arš.
 rbb 40) [r]kb 'rpt.
 ṭl. šmm. tskh
 41) [r]b*b. nskh. kbkbm

Column III

1) ttp. anhb*[m].
 d alp. šd] 2) zuh. b ym

her heart filled with joy,
 the liver³¹ of Anat with triumph.
 As she plunged her knees into the blood of guards,
 her thighs into the gore of warriors.
 Until she was sated she fought in the house,
 she slaughtered between the two tables.
 The blood of guards was wiped from the house,
 the oil of peace was poured into a bowl.
 Maiden Anat washed her hands,
 ybmt limm her fingers.
 She washed her hands free from the blood of guards,
 her fingers from the gore of warriors.
 She arranged chairs by chairs,
 tables with tables,
 footstools she arranged by footstools.
 She scooped up water and washed,
 dew of heaven, oil of earth,
 showers of the Charioteer of the Clouds.
 Dew which the heavens poured on her,
 showers which the stars poured upon her.³²

She made herself beautiful with the murex,
 whose source is a thousand acres in the sea.

Tablet 1.3 begins with a description of a divine banquet at which Baal is presented with a vast container of wine. The lacuna at the beginning of the column prevents us from ascertaining the context in which this banquet is presented,³³ but as part of the banquet scene we find someone singing about Baal whose attention is drawn to his daughters. After a substantial lacuna of perhaps 40 lines or so, we find Anat preparing her make-up and leaving her palace to engage in battle.

³¹I take *kbd* as 'liver' as part of the chiasmus 'liver - heart - liver', rather than 'in the hand of' dividing this as *k*- 'because' + the preposition *b*- and the noun *d* 'hand' (e.g. *TOu1* 160, Gordon 1977 77).

³²For stars as a source of precipitation cf. *TOu1* (161 n.e), Watson (1977 274).

³³Possibly a celebration of Baal's victory over Yam (Lipinski 1970, van Zijl 1972a 52).

Anat comes down from her mountain and battles between two cities, a location which should probably be regarded as mythic geography based on local topography. It seems that her enemies are humans (Miller 1973 47) and that they are drawn from a vast area; the merismus 'people of the sunset' || 'men of the sunrise' (i.e. from West to East) points to this. The motive for her action is entirely lost to us in the lacunae that precede and follow this episode, although this has not restrained commentators in attempting to find one. One rather less likely suggestion is that of de Moor (*ARTU* 4 n.21) who believes that Anat wreaks havoc out of frustration at her inability to bear children. This interpretation arises out of his reading of texts 1.10, 1.11 and 1.13, which as I argue in my analysis of these texts, is an opinion that finds little support in the texts themselves.

The vivid description of the slaughter in which she is engaged depicts her with heads at her feet and hands flying through the air, wading through the gore of the slain warriors, and tying grisly trophies to her body. Finally, she rounds up the survivors and makes her way back to her palace. The fact that Anat engages in a second slaughter within the confines of her own house has invited many different interpretations at this point. However, a comparison of the two descriptions reveals that at the end of the first battle we find a description of Anat driving her captives and her subsequent arrival at her palace, whereas this is absent from the end of the second battle where instead we find the cleansing of her palace and herself. If the battle scenes are identical, her actions immediately afterwards are significant in each context, and therefore it is possible that the rounding up of prisoners is to be understood as Anat bringing them back to her palace, perhaps echoing an historical practice of bringing prisoners of war back from the battlefield to be presented to the gods along with the spoils of war.

The second description of Anat massacring is set within her own palace. The language used is almost identical to that of the first, except that she is said to

battle between the two tables rather than the two cities. The battle ends with the statement that Anat is now satisfied (*šb'* line 29). It has been argued that this second description is merely pretence on the part of Anat, but if we relate her driving prisoners back to her palace as a reflection of a similar practice in the earthly conduct in war, then we may interpret this second massacre as the mythic equivalent of the slaughtering of prisoners as an act of devotional sacrifice that we find in the ancient Near East.³⁴ Mark Smith recently read a paper at the 1993 SBL meeting in Washington D.C. entitled '*Anat's Warfare Cannibalism and the West Semitic Ban*' in which he argued for 1.3.ii.20f. to be a portrayal of Anat consuming her victims as an extended description of *herem*-warfare. Although there is no explicit description of Anat devouring her captives, it may well be the case that this is how the sacrifice of prisoners of war to her may have been mythologised. A strong connection between death and the imagery of devouring cannot be denied; cultic sacrifice has an explicit program of death and consumption of the victim, and we should compare the imagery of devouring predicated of Mot (1.5.i) and the gods whose birth is depicted in 1.23.57f. who have one lip to heaven and the other to earth, and into which all creatures enter. Smith also suggested this interpretation for text 1.96 which he takes as a description of Anat devouring her brother, but which is better understood as an incantation against the evil-eye (see below).³⁵

³⁴Compare the many smiting scenes from Egyptian iconography in which the king is about to smash the heads of his prisoners of war and the many instances (alleged or otherwise) of human sacrifice to Yahweh under the *herem* principles of war, which included the massacre of all prisoners of war as votive sacrifices.

³⁵It is interesting to note similar imagery in Ez. 38.17f. in which God is preparing a great sacrifice (אֶבְרַח גְּדֹלָל) upon the mountains of Israel in which the flesh of mighty men (שֶׁר גִּבּוֹרִים) will be eaten and the blood of the princes of the earth (דָּם נְשִׂימָה אֲדָמָה) will be drunk, all consumed at Yahweh's table (עַל־שֻׁלְחָנִי). Miller (1973) also compares the Mesha inscription and Is. 34.

Following the second massacre we find Anat cleansing first her house, and then herself from the blood of her victims.³⁶ Again I see in this a mythic counterpart to the necessary cleansing operations that must have taken place in temples after the sacrificing of prisoners of war; presumably the temple furnishings were cleansed along with the cultic statue before which the victims were immolated.

Many earlier interpretations of this text have been greatly influenced by the Myth and Ritual school which analyses texts on the assumption that every myth is accompanied by a cultic ritual.³⁷ These kinds of analyses seek to impose a ritual foundation from which the myth is interpreted, and in the case of the present text, seek to find a ritual explanation for Anat's behaviour. For example, a recent analysis of this text by Korpel (1990) asserts that Anat's massacre is not to be taken literally (!) since it is merely a mythical representation of a sham combat (347) whose purpose was to bring on the fertility of the rain. Later she asserts that it is a mythic reflection of a cultic meal for the soldiers who enacted the sham combat (418) and claims that text 1.13 confirms that this was enacted in the cult. Not surprisingly we find that she adopts exactly the same stance as de Moor (*SP* 94f., *ARTU* 4 n.21). A further example comes from Gibson (1984 214) who explains text 1.3.ii "as a mythical mirror image of a rite proper to the late summer as people prayed desperately for the rains to come, a rite which may also be reflected in the capering and self-laceration of the prophets on Mt. Carmel"; in other words, this is a rite transferred into the mythic realm. However, this is not really an explanation of Anat's behaviour as such; it

³⁶Not washing her hands *in* the blood of the slain (e.g. Dussaud 1938 138f., Oldenburg 1969 88) as some sort of rejuvenation or fertility ritual, or connected with a rain charm. Oldenburg writes (89) "When the mist went up from the ground and fell down from heaven moistening the surface of the ground (at dawn), Anat was believed to be bathing." It is impossible to ground such statements in the text, and I prefer to understand this passage as Anat ridding her house and herself of the polluting effects of the blood.

³⁷For a survey of approaches to the Baal cycle see Smith (1986).

simply moves the goal-posts. Are we to 'explain' this text as a myth representing a sham combat, or is the ritual combat an earthly representation of the myth? In other words, the attempt to 'explain' myth by ritual simply reverses the question and we are faced with the equally perplexing question of where the ritual came from, if it is not a representation of the myth!³⁸ My observation above that the narrative may echo the cultic practice of offering prisoners of war to Anat, who is the ultimate warrior, is not intended to be an explanation of the text, nor do I attempt to reconstruct a fertility rite out of Anat's actions. I simply wish to show that the narrative has certain similarities with known historical practice and we can at least accept that myth was 'inspired' from human experience.

Rather than become involved in a detailed analysis of this kind of approach to the texts, I shall simply avoid any attempt at the reconstruction of cultic acts that may or may not have accompanied the myth. I accept the narrative on its own terms and shall attempt to understand it within its own literary framework. This, I feel, will prove to be the most productive method in achieving our aim of a credible analysis of the character of Anat within Ugaritic myth.³⁹

Within this episode Anat is depicted as a ferocious warrior. We are not told of any motive for her behaviour and we could draw the conclusion from this that she was capricious or cruel (Kapelrud 1969 52); but since we are unaware of the nature of the material that preceded and followed this episode this judgement might seem harsh. It is possible that the picture of Anat's character with which this pericope

³⁸Against the ritual interpretation of mythic texts see for example Fontenrose (1966), Kirk (1973), and in the context of Ugaritic myth Gibson (1984).

³⁹Bowman (1978 18) is a good example of how not to approach the text. He first assumes that whenever Anat sheds blood in the Baal cycle it is directly connected with the fertility of Baal, and then sets about seeking such an interpretation of this episode, which he finds in a yearly cycle of ritual combat to bring about the rains (20).

presents us is that of an ideal warrior type who is invincible, unmerciful, rejoicing in battle, and who can bring back much booty to offer the gods. As Walls (1992 165) states, perhaps this episode serves as our introduction to the warrior goddess Anat; this may be simplistic but I would be cautious of those interpretations which attempt to understand this episode in terms of a cultic ritual drama.⁴⁰

What, if any, conclusion can be drawn from the fact that a very similar scene opens text 1.13 (see below) is difficult to establish. In text 1.13, Anat massacres for a period of days, after which she goes up to El who blesses the offspring to which she will give birth. It appears from 1.13.29 that she is called 'cow of Baal' suggesting that she mated with Baal, rather than El who simply fulfils his recognised role as the god who blesses (royal?) offspring. If we compare this with text 1.3 we find that after Anat has finished massacring on earth, she is summoned to Baal, so that he can ask her for assistance in obtaining El's permission. Are we to see in this an invitation to engage in sexual intercourse with Baal?⁴¹ As the text stands today there is no indication that this happened. It could be argued that this took place in the fifteen or so lines missing from column iv after Anat makes herself beautiful with make-up, and there may just be enough room here to fit such an episode in, especially considering the laconic style of some of the copulation and birth scenes elsewhere (compare 1.5.v.18f. which may cover 10 lines or so). However, apart from a possible parallel with text 1.13, there are no indications in the narrative itself that such a scene was present; there is no mention of a child of Baal after this point, and there is no reason to believe that 1.13 mirrors the events of text 1.3; the possibility that 1.3.ii is simply

⁴⁰For a cross-cultural comparison of Anat's behaviour with other goddesses see Pope (1977 605f.) and Walls (chapter 2). While this kind of approach may be illuminating in terms of general patterns within myths, there is a danger that culture specific contexts are ignored in the attempt to highlight similarities.

⁴¹Wyatt (1988 382) suggests a *hieros gamos* after KTU 1.3.ii, but for different reasons.

an introduction to the character of Anat into the Baal cycle can also explain the episode at the beginning of 1.13, and it is preferable to keep these two texts separate.

Thus our picture of Anat in text 1.3.ii is one of a terrifying warrior goddess. We see her massacring in the field of battle and in her house/temple, and if, as I maintain, we can legitimately compare this narrative to historical practice, then perhaps in these two battle scenes we find in terms of mythic hyperbole the belief that Anat operated in the field of battle as well as in the immolation of votive offerings before her cultic statue: it was not her cultic servants who slaughtered the victims of Anat, but the goddess herself!

3.3.2.2. KTU 1.3.iii.4 - 31

The fragmentary nature of tablet 1.3 again leaves us with a substantial lacuna of around 20 lines between Anat cleansing herself and what follows. The text takes up the narrative at the point where Anat begins to sing about Baal and his daughters.

4) []š*t* rimt 5) l irth.	she puts her zither ⁴² (?) to her breast.
mšr. ⁴³ l. dd. aliyn 6) b'l.	She sings of the love of Valiant Baal,
yd. pdry. bt. ar	the love of Pidray, ⁴⁴ daughter of light, ⁴⁵
7) ahbt[.] tly. bt. rb.	the love of Tallay, daughter of shower,
dd. arsy 8) bt. y*bdr.	the love of Arsay, daughter of y'bdr ⁴⁶

⁴²Compare text KTU 1.101.16f. where *rimt* is paralleled by *knr* 'lyre' (MLC 183, de Moor 1986 222, ARTU 8), rather than 'corals' cf. hb. כַּנְרָה (e.g. TOu1 162 n.a, PLMU 78, CML2 48).

⁴³Examination of a colour slide at this point reveals damage to the surface of the tablet which makes it very difficult to verify KTU's reading. Compare 1.101.17 where we find 2fs imperfect *tšr*. If we are to read an initial *m* then this may be a scribal error (TOu1 162 n.b) but the damaged surface does not rule out reading *tšr* as in text 1.101 (de Moor 1969 183, CML2 48, MLC 183).

⁴⁴For a discussion on the names of these daughters, cf. SP 81f., TOu1 77f.

⁴⁵Cf. hb. אֶרֶב 'light' (TOu1 163, PLMU 78, MLC 183), rather than '(honey-)dew' cf. ar. *aryu* (SP 82, CML2 142).

<i>km ḡlmm</i> 9) <i>w. 'rbn.</i>	As servants, enter,
<i>l p'n. 'nt. h*br</i> 10) <i>w ql.</i>	at the feet of Anat bow and fall down,
<i>tšthwy. kbd hyt</i>	pay her homage and honour her.
11) <i>w. rgm. l bllt. 'nt</i>	And speak to the Maiden Anat,
12) <i>tny. l ymmt. limm</i>	repeat to <i>ymmt limm.</i>
13) <i>thm. aliyn. b'l.</i>	A message of Valiant Baal,
<i>hwt</i> 14) <i>aliy. qrdm.</i>	a word of the mightiest of warriors: ⁴⁷
<i>qryy. b arš</i> 15) <i>m*l*hm̄t</i>	Place ⁴⁸ into the earth pipes, ⁴⁹
<i>št. b 'prm. ddym</i>	put in the dust pots. ⁵⁰

⁴⁶Many scholars do not provide a translation for this name (Cassuto 1971, *TOu1*, *CML2*, *PLMU*, etc.). *SP* (84 n.6) suggests 'ample flowing' cf. ar. *wa'ibu* 'ample' and ar. *darra* akk. *nadarruru*, followed by *MLC* (560) 'crecida'.

⁴⁷On Baal's title *aliy qrdm* see Wyatt (1992 405).

⁴⁸This must be a fs imperative since in Anat's reply we have a 1s imperfect *aqry* (Cassuto 1971 124, *SP* 103, *TOu1* 163 n.e). For a discussion of this verb see *TOu1* (163 n.e), Walls (1992 168). We find *qry* in 1.3.ii.4 where Anat meets the servants at the foot of the mountain, but this would not be an appropriate parallel to *št* 'put'. Various suggestions include a cognate with ar. *qry* 'gather' (Cassuto 1971 124) in the sense of 'remove' (cf. Goetze 1944 19, Clifford 1972 68, van Zijl 1972a 53), a D-stem of *qry* 'bring a (sacrifice) to' (*SP* 103, *CML2* 157, cf. ar. *qarây*, eth. *aqāraya*), D-stem of *qry* 'oppose' (*MLC* 183, *ARTU* 9). The phrase *qrym ab dbh lilm* 'my father has presented a sacrifice to the gods' (1.19.iv.29) illustrates that Ugaritic *qry* may have a sacrificial connotation, and this would seem to fit the context of the present passage, especially the following bicolon in which Anat is asked to pour peace into the earth. Compare akk. *karāru* A 'to put an object in place, to set, lay (a foundation), to throw, cast' occurring at Ugarit (*CAD* K.207).

⁴⁹Generally *mlhm̄t* is taken in one of two ways; cognate with hb. מלחמה 'war', or related to the root *lhm* 'eat' well attested at Ugarit, giving something like 'foods, breads'. The first is proposed as an antithetical parallel to the later *šlm* translated as 'peace' (Goetze 1944, Cassuto 1971 124, Kapelrud 1969 101, van Zijl 1972a 55, *MLC* 183, *ARTU* 9). The translation of these two bicola are difficult indeed, each lexeme's translation depends on how we translate the others, resulting in several possible translations proposed by various scholars. My translation of the text at this point relies on understanding the actions described as those of a ritual act, the archaeological remains of which are described by Schaeffer (1939a 47), "a large baked clay pipe was buried upright in the ground, and through it libations were poured deep in the earth... pots were buried at the lower end of the pipe". I translate *mlhm̄t* in light of hb. מלחמה 'intestines, bowels' (*BDB* 535) as a poetic designation of these tubes that Anat is to insert into the earth, based on the morphological similarity of tubes and intestines, and perhaps resulting from the imagery of the offerings being poured into the *kbd* ('liver, innards') of the earth. However, I am acutely aware of the difficulties of this text and present this translation only tentatively.

⁵⁰The meaning of *ddym* has been derived from ug. *dd* 'love' (Goetze 1944, Cassuto 1971 125, van Zijl 1972a 55), hb. מנדקין 'mandrakes' (*CML2* 49, *ARTU* 9, Walls 1992 169) or *dd* 'pot' (Kapelrud 1969 101, Oldenburg 1969 89). As a suitable parallel to 'pipes' I accept the

- 16) *sk. šlm. l kbd. arš*
 17) *arbdd. l kbd. šdm*
 18) *hšk. 'šk. 'bšk*
 19) *'my. p'nk. tšmn.*
'my 20) twth. išk.
dm. rgm 21) it. ly. w. argmk
 22) *hwt. w. atnyk.*
rgm 23) 'š. w. lšt. abn
 24) *tant. šmn. 'm. arš*
 25) *thmt. 'mn. kbkbm*
 26) *abn. brq. d l. td'. šmm*
 27) *rgm. l td'. nšm.*
w. l tbn 28) hmlt. arš.
atm. w ank 29) ibgyh.
b tk. gry. il. špn
 30) *b qdš.*
b gr. nhlty
 31) *b n'm.*
b gb'. tliyt
- Pour peace (-offering⁵¹ ?) into the heart of the earth,
 accord⁵² in the heart of the fields.⁵³
 Grab your staff and your mace!⁵⁴
 Towards me let your feet hasten,
 towards me let your legs hurry.
 For I have a message I would tell you,
 A word I would repeat to you.
 A message of tree and a whisper of stone,
 the sighing of heaven to earth,
 of the deep to the stars.⁵⁵
 I understand lightning which the heavens do not know,
 a matter unknown to mankind,
 and not understood by the multitude of the earth.
 Come, and I shall reveal it,⁵⁶
 in the midst of my divine mountain, Saphon,
 in the sanctuary,
 in the mount of my inheritance,
 in the pleasant place,
 in the hill of victory.

translation 'pots'. De Moor (*SP* 103) has pointed out that the plural of 'pot' is *ddm* not *ddym* as we have here, but this may be a phonetic (or poetic?) variant.

⁵¹We find *šlmm*-offerings in many of the ritual texts, cf. *TRI*, *TOu2*, Janowski (1980), Dietrich and Loretz (1981); however, here we find the form *šlm* which suggests that we should take this as the abstract 'peace' (e.g. Cassuto 1971 91, van Zijl 1972a 55, *TOu1* 164, *MLC* 183, *ARTU* 9), rather than as 'peace-offering'.

⁵²'Repose, calm' cf. hb. רָבָדָה ar. *rabada* (del Olmo Lete 1978 40f., *MLC* 517, Walls 1992 170); following del Olmo Lete but with an etymology cf. ar. *brd* (with metathesis) 'coolness, sweetness, calm, piece' (de Moor 1986 219f., *ARTU* 9). For a discussion of other solutions see Janowski (1980 239f.), Walls (1992 170f.).

⁵³For the various meanings of *šd* in Ugaritic see e.g. Clifford (1972 83).

⁵⁴Following the suggestion of Cassuto (1971 126) to see *hšk* as cognate with hb. חָשַׁק 'withhold, refrain' and the solution of *MLC* (184). For alternative solutions cf. e.g. *SP* (106), *TOu1* (165), *CML2* 49.

⁵⁵Since we also find these words in the mouth of El (1.1.iii.10f.) this is probably a stereotyped formula and has no special significance in connection with Baal (Cassuto 1971 127).

⁵⁶*TOu1* (166 n.1) 'dévoiler' cf. ar. *faḡā*, *MLC* 'revelar, mostrar' cf. aram. *bē'ā*; this seems to make more sense than Baal saying he will try to discover it (Clifford 1972 70 n.46, *CML2* 49).

In line 8 we find direct speech to the servants of Baal without any usual formula of speech introduction, and in line 13 we are told they are to convey a message of Baal to Anat, thus indicating that the speaker is Baal himself. This suggests that the description of Anat's singing is one given by Baal to his servants rather than a narrative description of Anat's actions: in other words, Baal is describing to his servants what they will find when they reach Anat. In fact, the text does not narrate what Anat is doing as the servants arrive. We find instead a double line drawn across the column which is a device to inform the orator of this poem that a section of text has to be repeated from the previous narrative, presumably the journey of the servants and the actions of Anat before their arrival.⁵⁷

The message that Gupan and Ugar are to relay to Anat has been the focus for much discussion, particularly the two enigmatic bicola in lines 14-17. The second colon of the first couplet is in comparison relatively straightforward: *št b 'prm ddym*. The recognition of *št* as a feminine imperative 'Put!' provides us with a guide to the meaning of its syntactic parallel *qryy* which is likely to be a feminine imperative also. However, on the question of semantics, opinions are more divided (see my notes to the text and the discussion of Walls 1992 168f.). For guidance, I turn to the first colon of the second couplet. Here, Anat is asked to pour (*sk*) out *šlm* to the heart of the earth; we could gloss *šlm* as the abstract 'peace, well-being', but perhaps we should compare this to the actions of Anat at the end of her massacre in her palace where it is said that 'oil of peace (*šmn šlm*) was poured from a bowl' (lines 31-32). This is one of the first actions of Anat after her revelry in the gore of the slain, carried out after the blood was wiped from her house, and as such could be viewed as symbolic of her cessation of hostilities. Perhaps this is how we should understand text 1.3.iii. Anat is

⁵⁷Compare, for example, the rubric at *KTU* 1.4.v.42 written after a double line which instructs the orator to narrate the formulaic description of sending of the messengers (*CML*2 61 n.5).

called upon to pour peace onto the earth, and this is paralleled in the second colon of the second couplet by the offering *arbdd* with the imperative verb *sk* doing double duty for this bicolon. I take this to be a poetic variation on the *šlm* of the parallel line, and as such it is something to be poured into the tubes and pots described in the previous bicolon. As for the first bicolon, any translation is uncertain at this point because of the many unknown factors encountered here. In my notes to the text I have outlined my approach to it as a description of the cultic equipment placed into the earth so that the liquid offerings could be poured into the 'heart' (*kbd*) of the earth.

If we interpret these instructions in the light of Anat's actions of pouring out oil of peace in 1.3.ii, then perhaps we are to interpret them as a call from Baal to cease her warrior activities (Kapelrud 1969 102, Cassuto 1971 91, van Zijl 1972 58, Gray 1979 321, Gibson 1984 215), although it should be noted that by this point in the narrative, Anat has already ceased fighting (Walls 1992 172). Not surprisingly, this scene has been interpreted as a fertility rite where Anat is a fertility goddess (Oldenburg 1969 89, *SP* 104). However, if we attempt to understand the narrative in its own context without reconstructing alleged fertility rituals, we are left with the fact that Anat, who as we have just seen in text 1.3.ii is a warrior *par excellence*, is called upon to perform a ritual that may perhaps be connected with the cult of the dead (Schaeffer 1939a 44f., *SP* 104). Perhaps we are to see such an offering as a transitional rite: Anat, the warrior polluted by death and blood, performs the appropriate rituals to legitimise her return to the cult and thereby her relationship with Baal, which she does immediately after.

3.3.2.3. KTU 1.3.iii.32 - iv.4

From line 32f. the scene changes to narrate the reaction of Anat on seeing the approach of Gupan and Ugar, which is one of fear for the safety of Baal and a recapitulation of her efforts to wipe out his enemies.

32) <i>hlm. 'nt. tph. ilm.</i>	Behold! Anat perceived the two gods.
<i>bh. p'nm 33) ttf.</i>	At that her feet quaked, ⁵⁸
<i>b'dn. ksl. ttbr</i>	behind, her back ⁵⁹ broke,
34) <i>'ln. pnh. td'.</i>	above, her face sweated, ⁶⁰
<i>tḡṣ. pnt 35) kslh.</i>	the joints of her back convulsed, ⁶¹
<i>anš. dt. ṣrh.</i>	those of her neck became weak. ⁶²
<i>tšu 36) gh. w. tṣh.</i>	She lifted up her voice and cried:
<i>ik. mḡy. gpn. w ugr</i>	Why have Gupan and Ugar come?
37) <i>mn. ib. yp'. l b'l.</i>	What enemy has arisen ⁶³ against Baal?
<i>ṣrt 38) l rkb. 'rpt.</i>	What adversary against the Charioteer of the Clouds? ⁶⁴
<i>l mḥšt. mdd 39) il ym.</i>	Did I not destroy the beloved of El, Yam?
<i>l klt. nhr. il. rbm</i>	Did I not finish off River, the great god? ⁶⁵
40) <i>l ištbn. tnn.</i>	Shall I not muzzle ⁶⁶ the dragon?

⁵⁸MLC (589) 'temblar' cf. hb. טנ ar. *naṭṭa*. This seems more suitable than 'stamped' (TOu1 166, CML2 50) or 'stumbled' (Cassuto 1971 93).

⁵⁹Possible solutions include 'loins' (Cassuto 1971 130, CML2 50, Baldacci 1978 417), 'back' (MLC 184). However, we find *ksl* 'bow string' in 1.3.ii.16 which suggests 'tendon' (Wyatt, unpubl. transl.).

⁶⁰From a root *yd'* cf. ar. *wada'a* 'flow' eth. *waz'a* 'sweat' (CML2 148, MLC 558).

⁶¹Cf. ar. *naḡaḡa* (CML2 153, MLC 591), fits better than 'totter' cf. ar. *tḡṣ* (Cassuto 1971 130).

⁶²Taking *anš* as a verb cf. hb. שנס akk. *enēšu* (Cassuto 1971 130) and the relative referring back to the previous *pnt* (Cassuto 1971 131, Baldacci 1978 41, Wiggins 1993 49 n.129).

⁶³Cf. ar. *yafa'a* (van Zijl 1972a 63, CML2 148, MLC 561).

⁶⁴On this title of Baal see Wyatt (1992 420f.).

⁶⁵So Bordreuil and Pardee (1993 66). An alternative translation could be 'God of the Great Ones' (ARTU 11) as a reference to the monsters in the following list.

⁶⁶I take this is a 1s imperfect Gt-stem of *šbm*, cf. ar. *šabama* (Cassuto 1971 134, TOu1 168, MLC 627, ARTU 11), rather than 3ms perfect Gt-stem (CML2 50 n.5). Loewenstamm (1959 260f.) compares akk. *psm* 'muzzle' cognate with ar. and hb. *šbm* (with metathesis); he draws on

<i>ištm.</i> [] <i>xh</i>	I shall shut [its mouth ⁶⁷ (?)]?
41) <i>mḥšt. bṭn. 'qltn</i>	I destroyed the twisting ⁶⁸ serpent,
42) <i>šlyt. d. šb't. rašm</i>	the Coiler ⁶⁹ with seven heads. ⁷⁰
43) <i>mḥšt. mdd ilm. arš*</i>	I destroyed the beloved of the gods, ⁷¹ Arsh,
44) <i>šmt. 'gl. il. 'tk</i>	I exterminated the calf of the god, Atik.
45) <i>mḥšt. k. lbt. ilm. išt</i>	I destroyed the bitch of the gods, Fire,
46) <i>kl. bt. il. ddb.</i>	I finished off the daughter of the god, Flame. ⁷²
<i>im*thš. ksp⁷³ 47) itrt. hrš.</i>	I shall smite for the silver, I shall possess the gold,
<i>trd. b'l</i>	of the one who drives Baal
Column iv	
1) <i>b mrym. špn.</i>	from the heights of Saphon,

an Akkadian text in which Marduk beats and enemy and muzzles a lion to show that this sequence is not unusual. Gray's (1979 316 n.3) suggestion of an Ifteal passive is based on his assumption that Anat addresses Baal and therefore that the verb cannot be a first person. In order to make a distinction between the perfect and imperfect verbs of this passage, I translate the perfect forms as if they are actions that Anat performed in previous battles, and the imperfect forms as threats against the supposed enemies of Baal. However, it is not clear how such distinctions would have been understood by a contemporary audience. Compare the discussion of these forms by Fenton (1969a 200) as prefixed forms with infix -t- to be read as perfect. Opposed to ar. cognate *šbm* is Day (1985 14 n.32) who suggests 'lifted up', comparing its use in text 1.83.8-9.

⁶⁷Following the reading of *MLC* (185), *ARTU* (11), cf. hb. 𐎲𐎠𐎺 as a semantic parallel to 'muzzling', rather than *ištmli* of *CML2*. See the discussion on line 37 by Binger (1992 141f.). Pardee's (1984) collation of the text suggests we read *ištmḏ*ḥ** which he parses as a 1st person singular *yqt* Gt-stem of a root *šmd*, unattested in Ugaritic but found in hb., ar. and akk. meaning 'destroy'. Bordreuil and Pardee (1993 66) translate 'ne l'ai-je pas exterminé?'.

⁶⁸Cf. hb. 𐎲𐎠𐎺𐎠 in Is. 27.1 (*TOu1* 168 n.k, *CML2* 50, *MLC* 604).

⁶⁹I take *šlyt* as a verbal noun with preformative *š-* from the root *lyt* cf. hb. 𐎠𐎺𐎠 'wrap tightly, envelope' ar. *lāṭa* akk. *lātum*, as a parallel to the phrase 'twisting serpent' (Gray 1978 93, 1979 316 n.4, Margalit 1980 90). Alternative are from the root *šlt* 'to slit' (*MLC* 629, but see Watson 1977 275), or 'master, tyrant' cf. hb. 𐎠𐎺𐎠 (*CML2* 158) or a *šql* form cognate with akk. *lātu* giving 'tyrant, controller' (de Moor 1979 641 n.12, *ARTU* 11).

⁷⁰For Akkadian support for the serpent having multiple heads see Watson (1977 274).

⁷¹We could possibly take *mdd ilm* and the later *klbt ilm* to mean 'beloved of the god' and 'bitch of the god' respectively, the 'god' being a reference to Yam/Nahar rather than El, taking these to be part of the retinue of Yam defeated by Anat.

⁷²See Watson (1978 397) for an Akkadian passage which illustrates a further connection between canines and fire. Van Soldt (1989 373) suggests that the *d* is a scribal error for *š*.

⁷³Following the reading of *KTU* rather than *imthš w* of the earlier editions.

<i>mšš*š. k. 'šr* 2) udnh.</i>	who makes him fly up ⁷⁴ like a bird from his perch, ⁷⁵
<i>gršh. l ksi. mlkh</i>	who drives him from the seat of his kingship,
<i>3) l nht.</i>	from his couch,
<i>l kht. drkth</i>	from the seat of his dominion.
<i>4) mnm. ib. yp'. l b'l</i>	What enemy has arisen against Baal?
<i>šrt. l rkb. 'rpt</i>	What adversary against the Charioteer of the Clouds?

The reaction of Anat to the approach of Baal's messengers is one of anxiety, fearing that some enemy has risen up against Baal.⁷⁶ The physiological description of Anat's fear is formulaic (Hillers 1965), witnessed also in the reaction of Athirat on seeing the approach of Baal and Anat and fearing for the safety of her children (1.4.ii.12f.; Wiggins 1993 48f.), in the reaction of Danil on hearing the message that his son was dead (1.19.ii.44f. although broken), and in a less stereotyped fashion, the reaction of Thitmanat on seeing the approach of her brother Elhu and fearing for the health of her father (1.16.i.54f.). In view of the above parallels we cannot attach any special significance to the description of Anat's reaction, but her reaction of anxiety itself is interesting. In the theme of Baal's palace it is apparent that

⁷⁴Taking *mššš* as a š-stem participle of root *nš* cf. hb. נָשַׁח in La. 4.15 (Sanmartín 1978a 449, Gray 1979 317 n.8), or perhaps hb. נָשַׁח 'fly' (compare the translation of *ARTU* 12 "who tries to make (him) fly up like a bird from his aerie"). Other suggestions include 'struck' (del Olmo Lete 1978 42f.), 'peck' (*CML* 2 50). Cassuto (1971) reads *mš šš[h]* as "has his crown fallen...?" comparing *mš* to hb. שָׁחַב and *šš* to hb. כִּנֹּר 'crown'.

⁷⁵Gray (1979 317 n.8) suggests 'dominion' which fits the context better than 'who pecked/struck his ear like a bird' given by many translators. This relates *udn* to the more usual *adn*, but compare the forms *adr* and *udr*. Better still is to see *udn* cognate with hb. יָדָן and gloss as 'pedestal' (possibly referring to the stands on which cult statues are placed?) or 'perch' in keeping with the avian simile of this colon (Dijkstra 1970, *ARTU* 12, Wyatt, unpubl. transl.).

⁷⁶I am not certain that I agree with Walls (1992 176f.) who sees in Anat's reaction a portrayal of the goddess as becoming "overly excited" or that the narrative portrays her as a volatile and fractious character, especially in light of the fact that her physiological symptoms are stereotypical, and that her list of previous victories seems more to do with her protectiveness over Baal rather than sheer boastfulness. However, this is simply a matter of personal opinion on the subtleties of the narrative, and an ancient Ugaritan may have perceived things very differently.

Baal is enjoying a state of relative peace⁷⁷ which serves to throw Anat's reaction into greater relief and makes us wonder why she is so anxious for Baal's safety. Perhaps her reaction indicates an undercurrent of constant threat to the well-being of Baal from his enemies, so that he has always to be on his guard, although there is no certainty in this.

The list of defeated enemies that follows in Anat's speech is headed by Yam || Nahar in lines 38f. and this immediately directs our attention to the struggle between Baal and Yam narrated primarily in text 1.2.⁷⁸ However, from the text as we have it today, Anat does not appear to have been involved in that struggle and yet appears to claim credit for the destruction not only of Yam himself, but of his monstrous retinue,⁷⁹ although as Day (1985 15) points out, there is no indication in text 1.2 that Yam had accomplices. In order to obviate a potential contradiction in the narrative, some scholars parse the verbs in the list of 1.3.iii as both first and second person. A good example of this approach is seen in Gray (1979 316) who parses *mḥšt* and *klt* (lines 35-36) as 2ms perfect, *ištbm* (line 37) as an ifteal passive, *mḥšt* (lines 38 and 40) as 2ms perfect, and *smt*, *mḥšt*, *klt*, *imthš* and *itr̥t* (lines 41-44) as first person forms.⁸⁰ This analysis assumes that Anat is addressing Baal directly through the intermediaries Gupan and Ugar, and this kind of direct address to the sender of a

⁷⁷Only in the enigmatic passage 1.4.vii do we find a possible reference to Baal engaged in battle, seizing (*aḥd*) cities before entering his new house. This is certainly a very minor incident in the overall context of Baal's palace.

⁷⁸For a discussion of these texts and their relevance for understanding the dragon motif in Hebrew literature see *inter alia* Day (1985) and Kloos (1986); for the specifically Ugaritic material see Binger (1992) but see my discussion of her arguments below.

⁷⁹Compare the retinue of Tiamat in *Enuma Elish* (TOu1 167).

⁸⁰Compare this with the analysis of Kapelrud (1969 61f.) who is at least more consistent, taking most of the verbs as 2ms perfects with the exception of *ištbm* of line 37 and *imthš* and *itr̥t* of lines 43-44 as first person imperfect forms, or Binger (1992) who takes the verbs in lines 35-36 as 2ms but the rest as 1st person forms.

message in the presence of the messengers is one that is found elsewhere within the Baal cycle, e.g. El's answer to the demands of Yam in 1.2.i.36f. (addressing Yam directly with vocative *y-* prefixed to his name), and Mot's answer to Baal's invitation where he addresses himself directly to Baal in the presence of Gupan and Ugar who then return to Baal with Mot's answer (1.5.i.1f.). Thus it is not impossible that Anat addresses herself directly to Baal through his messengers using second person verbs, although the interpretation of the *l-* prefix to Baal's name (lines 37-38) as a vocative (Kapelrud 1969) is less likely, I believe, since the verb *yp'* 'rises up' is best understood to be followed by an indirect object with the preposition *l-* 'against' (Gray 1979 316).

A pertinent parallel to the speech of Anat is that of Mot in 1.5.i.1f. where he addresses himself directly to Baal through the messengers.⁸¹ We read,

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 1) <i>k tmḥṣ. ltn. bṭn. brḥ</i> | Because ⁸² (?) you smote Lotan, the fleeing serpent, |
| 2) <i>tkly. bṭn. 'qltn.</i> | you finished off the twisting serpent, |
| 3) <i>šlyt. d. šb't. rašm</i> | the Coiler with seven heads. |

From the parallelism of this tricolon we can determine that Lotan is the serpent, identified as one of the enemies of Baal in lines 41-42 of Anat's speech. This perhaps lends weight to the argument that Anat addresses Baal in her speech rather than claiming these defeats for herself. However, in the passage 1.5.i.1f. we find verbs that are very likely to be parsed as 2ms imperfect, since we find in line 5 the 2ms object suffix *-k* which indicates a direct address to Baal.⁸³ In Anat's speech on the

⁸¹I prefer this interpretation of the first few lines of 1.5.i over that of Margalit (1980 87f.) who translates the verbs as passives and sees this short passage (lines 1-9) as part of the speech of Baal to Gupan and Ugar which is now repeated in the mouth of Mot.

⁸²Cf. Emerton (1972 53f.), van Selms (1975).

⁸³I strongly disagree with Binger's (1992 145) almost paranoid defence of Anat as the dragon-slayer of Ugarit and her assertion that we must take the subject of 1.3.iii to be the same as 1.5.i or else we make Anat to be a liar. I see no contradiction in both Baal and Anat claiming to have slain the same monsters since clearly it is the case within Ugaritic myth that death is no

other hand, the perfect verbs with suffixed *-t* can indicate all singular forms except 3ms, which gives rise to the ambiguity of her speech. The mixture of forms, perfect and imperfect, could be an indication of change of subject of the verbs, but I prefer to take all the verbs as first person,⁸⁴ translating the perfects as referring to what Anat has done to Baal's enemies, and the imperfect as threats against those enemies she believes are now rising up against Baal, although the perfect-imperfect shifts could be stylistic rather than grammatical.⁸⁵

If we accept that Anat's speech in 1.3.iii.38f. is a list of her former exploits, then we are left to face the question of how we are to construe the relationship between this text and the defeat of Yam at the hand of Baal (with the help of Kothar). It should be noted first that there are no compelling grounds for thinking these are two versions of the same event. If it is objected that Anat claims to have finished off Yam and his retinue quite convincingly, and that the same is said for Baal, then we need only look to the theme of Baal and Mot to see how within a coherent narrative Mot can be utterly destroyed by Anat and yet later be involved in a struggle with Baal. As with the Mot versus Baal theme, so we find two episodes in which Yam is defeated.⁸⁶ Since Baal's victory over Yam appears to be followed by the theme of building Baal's palace, it would seem logical to place any conflict between Anat and Yam at a time before that of Baal and Yam. This is the conclusion of Gibson (1984

barrier to a god's healthy return to active service! Compare Baal's address to Anat in 1.10.ii.24f. where both deities fight Baal's enemies as a team.

⁸⁴This is a possibility admitted by Gray (1979 316 n.3) as an alternative to his own translation, although he explains it by understanding that Anat finishes the work that Baal had begun.

⁸⁵My thanks to Dr N. Wyatt for suggesting this alternative.

⁸⁶Or rather, one scene which narrates this, and another in which it is claimed.

211f.) who suggests either seeing a victory of Anat over Yam in tablet 1.1, or in a tablet missing from the beginning of the cycle.

Wyatt's (1987) attempt at solving the dilemma of 'who killed the dragon?' is novel in that he concludes a four-fold conspiracy against the beast: Baal and Anat form one couple, El and Athirat the second couple. He begins by arguing for Athirat as a dragon slayer, although he openly admits that "Ugarit mythology gives no account of this myth". His idea is based on two pieces of evidence; Athirat's full name, *rbt atrt ym*, which he translates as "the Lady who treads on the Sea [-dragon]" following Albright (1968 105) and which he takes to be an allusion of this lost Ugaritic myth. However, this understanding of the goddess' name has been challenged convincingly by Margalit (1990) and can no longer be supported. His second piece of evidence depends on accepting the equivalence of Athirat and Shapshu on the basis of the pre-Islamic South Arabian pantheon structure, a method that has recently been criticised by Wiggins (1993 163f.). In order to support an Ugaritic tradition of El slaying the dragon, Wyatt turns to Hebrew myth which claims Yahweh as a dragon-slayer, and argues that since Yahweh is closely associated with El, then El must also have been seen as a dragon-slayer (cf. Miller 1973 58). However, it is entirely possible that Yahweh appropriated Canaanite traditions belonging to both El and Baal, and it would be unwise to attempt a reconstruction of either based on the Hebrew god. With all this in mind, I would reject Wyatt's proposed solution of who killed the dragon and suggest that there is no incongruity in accepting that both Anat and Baal could be thought of as dragon-slayers within the Baal cycle, since Yam could be defeated more than once.

I find the arguments of Tilde Binger (1992) extraordinary. In a short paper she attempts to demonstrate that at Ugarit it is really Anat who is the dragon-slaying deity. She bases her arguments on four texts: *KTU* 1.3.iii, 1.5.i.1f. (+27-31), 1.83, and 1.46. For the first two texts she makes the case for the subject of the verbs

to be grammatically ambiguous since the verb forms can be either masculine or feminine. Arguing that the subject of these two texts must be the same person, she turns to text 1.83, where she states that reading the verbs (which have *t-* prefix) as 3fs forms gives us a feminine subject as the dragon-slayer who must therefore be Anat. This is rather perplexing, since she could just as easily parse the verbs as 2ms and state that the subject is masculine and presumably Baal! She summarises her position (page 147) on the first three texts thus, “We now have three mythological texts from Ugarit, all containing allusions to a fight against one or more dragons (and monsters), all with verbs that can refer to Baal or Anat.” Her final, and ultimately crucial, piece of evidence is text 1.46.17. Here, she points to the fact that although *CTA* and *KTU* read ‘*nt špn*, *UT* (texts 9) reads ‘*nt ltn*. Binger defends *UT*’s reading of the text and criticises *CTA* and *KTU* for emending the text on the basis of *KTU* 1.109. She writes,

the fact that Anat, in another list of sacrifices, is called Anat Špn, ... does not, automatically, render the writing of this list of sacrifices faulty.

This might be sound advice for some texts, but Binger fails to mention that text 1.46.10f. is in fact a copy (albeit rather damaged) of text 1.109.1-14a where we clearly read in lines 13-14 ‘*nt špn*.⁸⁷ Binger’s final conclusion reads (page 149),

The four texts discussed in this article, and particularly the last one, *CTA* 36, shows, that if one disregards the OT, and the Babylonian Enuma Elish, as a source of information on this myth, the Ugaritic texts we have today clearly point to Anat as the dragon-fighting god of the Ugaritic pantheon.

As I have attempted to demonstrate however, Binger herself admits that three of her texts are grammatically ambiguous and her fourth depends on accepting *UT*’s reading a damaged surface over that of *CTA* and *KTU* in a text which is clearly a copy, when the copy does not support her theory since it reads ‘*nt špn* and has

⁸⁷*CTA*’s transcription could be transliterated ‘*nt l*tn*’; however, looking at the plate (XLII) we can see that there are two vertical wedges which stand out clearly, whilst the rest is unclear. I cannot make out the features Binger claims to see in the *CTA* plate.

nothing to do with the dragon-slaying motif. Finally, she forgets to mention that if we are to accept her argument that it is Anat who is the dragon slayer in Ugaritic myth, then we must also disregard the evidence of *KTU* 1.2!

Text 1.83.8 has been taken by some to be a reference of Anat slaughtering the dragon (*tnn*). The important text runs from line 8,⁸⁸

8) *tan (tnn). l šbm* 9) *tšt.*
trks 10) *l mrym. lbn*t*

You (?)⁸⁹ put the dragon in a muzzle,
 You bound it to the heights of Lebanon.

There is no mention of the name of the subject in this text and the translation of the verbs as 3fs forms (Clifford 1972 60, Margalit 1980 90, Day 1985 16, Binger 1992 146) with the understanding that they refer to Anat is based solely on the fact that Anat muzzles (*šbm*) the dragon (*tnn*) in text 1.3.iii.40. On the other hand, the verbs could be 2ms (*TOu2*, *ARTU* 182) and could therefore be an address to Baal who is the adversary of *ltn* in 1.5.i.1, and apparently the slayer of the dragon (*tnn*) in 1.82.1f. alongside Reshef (Day 1985 16, *TOu2* 61f.).

3.3.2.4. *KTU* 1.3.iv.21 - 46

After Anat's outburst, the messengers have to allay her fears by asserting that no enemies have arisen against Baal; they have come with a request of Baal that Anat go to meet him. They repeat what they have to say to Anat, and then Anat begins to speak.

21) *w t*⁴n*. bllt*. [']n*t.*
ttb 22) *y*[bmt.] l*imm*.*

And the Maiden Anat answered,
 [*ybmt*] *limm* responded:

⁸⁸On this text see Day (1985 14f.), *TOu2* (28f.), *ARTU* (181f.), Binger (1992 146f.).

⁸⁹The person of the verb is uncertain; preformative *t-* could indicate 2ms or 3fs imperfect. Binger (1992 147) appears to waver on this point. Initially she says "reading the verbs in this text as 3 per. fem. sing. gives a new, and (when related to *CTA* 2), surprising piece of information: it is a female, probably Anat, that fights Yam." However, further on she admits that the verbs could relate to either Baal or Anat.

[a]n*. a*qry 23) [b arš]. mlhm*t*

[. aš]t. b 'prm 24) d*d*y*m*[.]

a*sk. [šlm.] l kbd. arš

25) ar*[bdd.] l* k*b[d. š]d*m*.

yšt 26) x[]. b*'l. md*l*h.

yb'r 27) []k*(?) []r*nh.

aqry 28) a*(?)r*(?)xx b* a*r*š*. mlhmt

29) ašt*[. b] *p[r]m*. ddym*.

ask 30) šlm. l kbd*. awš (arš).

arbdd 31) l kbd. š[dm].

ap. mtn. rgmm 32) argmn.

l*k*. lk. 'nn. ilm

33) atm. bštm. w an. šnt

34) ugr. l rhq. i*lm.

i*nbb 35) l rhq. ilnym.

tn. m*tpdm 36) tht. 'nt. arš.

tl̄t. mth. gyrm

37) idk. l ttn pnm.

'm. b'l 38) mrym. špn.

I shall place [in the earth] pipes,

[I shall put] in the dust pots.

I shall pour [peace] into the heart of the earth,

[accord] in the heart of the fields.

Let Baal put his thunder-bolt [in the heavens (?)],⁹⁰

may [the god Haddu (?)]⁹¹ ignite his lightning flash.⁹²

I shall place in the earth pipes,⁹³

I shall put in the dust pots.

I shall pour peace into the heart of the earth,

accord into the heart of the fields.

Also another message I would tell you:

Go! Go! divine servants.

You may delay,⁹⁴ but I shall hurry,

Ughar⁹⁵ of the most distant gods,

Inbab of the most distant divinities.

Two layers under the springs of the earth,

three measures of the depths.⁹⁶

Then, she set her face,

towards Baal of the heights of Saphon,

⁹⁰Restoring [bšmm] (CML 88, SP 109, CML2 50, MLC 187), rather than [lišt] (Cassuto 1971 94). On *mdl* see de Moor (1966 70).

⁹¹Perhaps restoring [il hd q] with many others. For the alternatives cf. MLC 187. On *hd* as a title of Baal see Wyatt (1992 412).

⁹²With SP (109), CML2 (51), MLC (187).

⁹³Reading *aqry an barš*; compare 1.1.ii.19f., 1.3.iii.14f., 1.3.iv.8f., 1.3.iv.22f.

⁹⁴Dual form of root *bš* 'delay' cf. hb. שָׁבַח ar. *bassa* (Clifford 1972 56 n.59, *TOuI* 171 n.u, CML2 143, Dietrich and Loretz 1980c 385, MLC 530).

⁹⁵The absence of a preposition here is problematical; does Anat say she will go from or to the mountain? It is tempting to see in *u_gr* an error for *l_gr*, a difference of the absence of the one horizontal stroke on the bottom of the three vertical strokes of *u*, which would then give us, 'you may delay, but I will hurry, to the mountain of the most distant gods, (to) Inbab of the most distant divinities' (Wyatt, unpubl. transl.). The fact that Anat then sets her face towards Saphon raises no real problem in the context of mythic topography where Saphon is at the centre of the Ugaritic world. Dietrich and Loretz (1980c 383) read *b!gr*. Examination of a colour slide of the tablet clearly shows a *u_gr* at the beginning of line 34, so this theory must assert an error on the part of the scribe. Alternatively, Clifford (1972 87 n.59) divides *u gr*, taking this bicolon as a rhetorical question "Is not (my) mountain distant from El, || 'nbb distant from the deities". For a discussion of Inbab as the residence of Anat see Clifford (1972 86f.).

⁹⁶Cf. ar. *ḡawru* (MLC 606).

b alp. šd. rbt. kmn
 39) *hlk. aḥth. b'l. y'n.*
tdrq 40) y bnt. abh.
*šrhq. att. l pnnh**
 41) *št. alp. qdmh.*
mria. w tk 42) pnh.
thšpn. mh. w trḥš
 43) *tl. šmm.*
šmn. arš.
tl. šm[m. ts]kh*
 44) *rbb. nskh. kbkbm.*
 45) *tpp. anhbm.*
d alp. šd 46) z'u[h. b ym*

from a thousand miles, ten thousand leagues.⁹⁷
 The coming of his sister Baal saw,
 the approach of the daughter⁹⁸ of his father.
 He dismissed the women from before him.
 He set an ox before her,
 a fatling as well in her presence.
 She scooped up water and washed,
 dew of heaven,
 oil of earth,
 dew which the heavens poured on her,
 with rain which the stars poured on her.
 She made herself beautiful with the murex,
 whose source is a thousand acres [in the sea.]

The answer of Anat to the message of Baal is less problematical than her preceding speech. She begins by stating that she will carry out Baal's wishes, but then she appears to lay down a condition: Baal must show proof that his boast to understand the lightning is not unfounded by showing it in the heavens. Anat then sets out for Saphon, residence of Baal (cf. e.g. 1.100.9), and on her arrival is presented with a banquet before Baal gets down to the business of asking her for help.

3.3.2.5. KTU 1.3.iv.53 - v.4

After Anat has cleansed herself, Baal expresses his complaint that he does not have a house like other gods, and this moves Anat to help him obtain El's permission.

⁹⁷Although surface measurements (*TOul* 172 n.a), it is perhaps better to translate them here as linear measurements; those I give here are suggested by Wyatt (unpubl. transl.). See e.g. Cassuto (1971 139) for discussion.

⁹⁸I follow Cassuto's (1971 139) explanation which sees the *y* as a scribal error, who began to write out the usual epithet of Anat as we find in the parallel passage 1.4.ii.12f., but then continued with 'daughter of her father' (van Selms 1954 19 n.24, *TOul* 172 n.b, Dietrich and Loretz 1980c 384). For *bnt* 'daughter' see *UT* (19.1068). Also taken as an error for *bt* (*MLC* 187), or an error for *ybmt* (*CML2* 52). *ARTU* (14 n.70) translates 'the Wanton Widow of his father', explaining that at Baal's death, his father (who is Dagan) and his brothers were under the obligation to marry Anat, who had now become a 'Wanton Widow'.

w t'n*[, btl't. 'nt]

54) ytb ly. tr. il*[. aby]

55) ytb. ly. w lh. []

Column v

1) [] msh. nn. k imr. l arš

2) [ašhl]k*. šbth. dmm.

šbt. dqnh 3) []

xd. l ytn. bt. l b'l*. k ilm

4) [w hz]r. k bn. atrt

And Maiden Anat answered:

Bull El [my father] will answer me,

he will answer me and to him (?) []

I shall drag him like a lamb to the ground,⁹⁹

[I shall make] his grey hair run with blood,

the grey hair of his beard [with gore].¹⁰⁰

If¹⁰¹ he does not give Baal a house like the gods,

[and a court] like the sons of Athirat.

Here we see Anat making threats against El himself, which serves to emphasise her aggressive character within the Ugaritic pantheon. We have already seen that she destroys the enemies of Baal (1.3.iii) which may be considered a constructive action since Yam was considered as a negative chaotic element in Ugaritic theology,¹⁰² but here she threatens the head of the pantheon himself. This has led many scholars to assume that El's power was waning and that Baal was poised to become head of the Ugaritic pantheon (e.g. Kapelrud 1952, Pope 1955 and 1987, Oldenburg 1969, Miller 1973 48, etc.) although this is vigorously denied by others (e.g. L'Heureux 1979, Gibson 1984 207f.). This is not the place to engage in a discussion of the status of El at Ugarit, but I would say that in the sequence of tablets that we follow, it is apparent that Anat's request for El's permission is denied since in tablet 1.4 we find Baal and Anat supplicating Athirat to plead on Baal's behalf for El's

⁹⁹Cf. ar. *maṣāḥa* (TOu1 173 n.e, SP 111, CML2 151, MLC 582).

¹⁰⁰Restoring *mm'm* after 1.3.v.25 (Cassuto 1971 98, SP 110, CML2 52, MLC 189).

¹⁰¹Reading *kd 'if* (CML2 52).

¹⁰²Gibson (1984).

permission.¹⁰³ In this understanding of the texts, it seems that El is still the undeniable ruler of the pantheon since Baal cannot act without El's permission, and cannot rely on Anat's bullying tactics to force him to grant permission.

3.3.2.6. KTU 1.3.v.19 - 43

After Anat's description of her intentions towards El if he denies Baal permission to build himself a house, she leaves Baal and sets off to confront El. After some fragmentary text which narrates her stereotyped journey to the abode of El, Anat bursts into El's abode, dispenses with the customary greeting rituals, and launches into her verbal attack of El.

19) <i>w t'n. bt*l*t. *n[t. bnt.] b*ht</i> 20) <i>k. y ilm. bnt[.] b*h*[t]k*. a*[l. t]s*m*h</i>	And the Maiden Anat spoke: [Let not the sons] ¹⁰⁴ of your mansion, O El, let not the daughters of your mansion rejoice, let not the children ¹⁰⁵ of [your palace] rejoice.
21) <i>al. tšmh. b r*m*[. h]k*l[k]</i>	I shall surely seize them with [my hand (?)],
22) <i>al. aḥdhm. b y[]y*</i> <i>h*[]xxx</i> 23) <i>b gdl. arkty.</i>	[I shall smite them (?)] by the strength of my long arm. ¹⁰⁶
<i>a*m*x[]</i> 24) <i>qdqdk.</i>	I shall [smite (?)] your crown,

¹⁰³The solution of Obermann (1948 12f.), Bowman (1978 49), Margalit (1980 11), etc., that texts 1.3 and 1.4 are two different recensions or variant versions of the same theme, remains unconvincing, and a rearrangement of the order of the tablets such as de Moor (*SP*, *ARTU*) is based on a great deal of speculation of what must be missing from the texts. The order of *CTA* 1-6, accepted by the majority of scholars, seems to be the most acceptable order in my opinion, in which case we are faced with the assumption that Anat's mission to El is unsuccessful.

¹⁰⁴Reading [*bnm*] 'sons' as a parallel to *bnt* 'daughters' which makes better sense of the 3pl object suffix on *aḥdhm* as a reference back to El's children (*ARTU* 17, Wyatt, unpubl. transl.) *CML2* (54) translates 'in the building of' from the root *bny* 'build'. *MLC* (190) takes *bnt* as a form of the preposition *b-*. Cf. Dijkstra and de Moor (1975 192), but with a slight variation.

¹⁰⁵Restoring *bnm* (*CARTU* 7). Examination of a colour slide at this point reveals little of the orthography of this lexeme. The initial *b* is clearly visible, but the surface of the tablet is degraded after this and we cannot make out any other graphemes. Unfortunately, the parallel passage in 1.18.i.6f. is also damaged at this point and cannot be used to aid us in a proper reconstruction of the text.

¹⁰⁶As a suitable parallel to *by[mm]y*; compare "ma vaste envergure" (*TOu1* 175 n.p) referring to Anat in the form of a bird.

*ašhlk. š*bt*k*[. dmm]*
 25) *šbt. dqnk. mm'm[.]*
*y'ny 26) il. b šb't. ḥdr*m**
b tmnt 27) ap. sgrt.
yd'[tk.] bt. k an[št]*
 28) *k in. b ilht. ql*[š]k**.

mh. taršn 29) l bilt. 'nt.*
w t[']n*. bilt. 'nt**
 30) *thmk. il. ḥkm[.]*
ḥkmk 31) 'm. 'lm.
ḥyt. ḥzt. thmk
 32) *mlkn. aliyn. b'l.*
tp̄n 33) in. d 'lnh.
kl̄nyy. qšh 34) nbl̄n.
kl̄nyy. nbl̄. ksh
 35) *any. l yšh. tr. il. abh.*
il 36) mlk. d yknnh.
yšh. atr̄t 37) w bnh.
ilt. w šbr̄t. arḥh (aryh)
 38) *wn. in. bt[.] l b'l. km. ilm*
 39) *ḥzr. k b*[n.] a*tr̄t.*
mt̄b. il 40)
mzll. b[nh.
m[̄]b. rbt. atr̄t 41) ym.*
mt̄b. [pdr]y. bt. ar*
 42) *[mzll.] tly*[. bt.] r*b**
mt̄b 43) [ar̄sy. bt. y'bdr.]
*m*t̄b**

I shall make your grey hair run [with blood],
 the grey hair of your beard with gore.
 El answered from the seven chambers,
 from the eight entrances of the closed rooms.
 I know you, daughter, indeed you are incorrigible,¹⁰⁷
 indeed among goddesses there is no holding you
 back.¹⁰⁸
 What do you desire, O Maiden Anat?
 And Maiden Anat answered:
 Your word, El, is wise,
 your wisdom is eternal,
 a life of good fortune is your word.
 Our king is Valiant Baal,
 Our judge, there is none greater.¹⁰⁹
 We two should carry his chalice,
 we two should carry his cup.
 Groaning, he cries out to Bull El his father,
 to El the king who begot him.
 He cries out to Athirat and her sons,
 to the goddess and band of her kinsmen.
 Baal has no house like the gods,
 no court like the sons of Athirat,
 The dwelling of El
 is the shelter of his son,
 The dwelling of Lady Athirat of the sea,
 is the dwelling of Pidray, daughter of light,
 is the shelter of Tallay daughter of showers,
 is the dwelling of Arsay, daughter of y'bdr
 is the dwelling [of the perfect brides (?)]

¹⁰⁷Suggested translations include: 'like a man/like men' (Kapelrud 1969 65, Dijkstra and de Moor 1975 193, *CML2* 141, *ARTU* 17), 'gentle' cf. ar. *anisa* (*CML2* 141), 'Schwach sein, werden' (Dietrich and Loretz 1977a 49), or cf. hb. שָׁלֵם (*DCH* 1.344) in the sense of 'invincible' (Cassuto 1971 149), 'irascible' (*TOu1* 176), 'incurable' (*MLC* 516), or 'incorrigible' (Walls 1992 178). See the discussion of Walls (1992 84f.).

¹⁰⁸Cf. ar. *qallaša* (*UT* 19.2234, *MLC* 618), and the discussion in Walls (1992 192).

¹⁰⁹Or perhaps a tricolon, "Our king is Valiant, Baal is our ruler, and there is none above him" (Wyatt 1992 404).

Anat begins her attack by directing her threats towards the children of El (lines 19-23). This interpretation is not certain since there are several lacunae and what text remains is unclear in many points. However, in line 20 we find the lexeme *bnt* which has prompted many interpreters to see a verbal form of the root *bny* 'build' (CML2 54, Walls 1992 178). In this view, Anat attempts to gain El's permission for Baal to begin building a house by threatening the existence of El's own house; a vivid piece of poetic imagery. However, from what little remains of text 1.18.i.6f. it seems that this same piece of rhetoric is used by Anat in her attempt to obtain El's permission to carry out her will against Aqhat, and if this is the case, then we cannot read any great significance into a supposed threat against El's palace here in text 1.3.v since we are dealing with a stereotyped address. One problem with the above interpretation is that in line 22 Anat threatens to seize *them* (*ahdhm*), i.e. a plural object. We could argue that this is a reference to the plurality of El's palace: recall that El answers Anat from within his seven chambers and his eight closed rooms (lines 26-27). However, a far better object of Anat's aggressive activities is provided by de Moor and Spronk's analysis of the text at this point: in the lacuna of line 19 they restore [*bnm*] as a parallel to *bnt* of line 20, thus giving us the group 'sons' || 'daughters'. Furthermore, in line 21 we have the difficult reading *b*r*m** which they read *bnm* as the generic 'children' (CARTU 7). Examination of a colour slide of the tablet reveals that the text is badly damaged at this point and that a reading of *bnm* is possible.

On de Moor and Spronk's suggested reading, the object of Anat's threats are the children of El rather than the house of El, and therefore the children of Athirat also. This aggression towards the other deities of the Ugaritic pantheon is entirely in character for Anat, as witnessed in her attacks on Yam and Mot, and by the reaction of Athirat on seeing the approach of Baal and Anat (see below). She then turns her attention to the old god himself, threatening to make his grey hair turn red with blood;

in other words, she will smash his head. This fits perfectly with what we see of her character in 1.3.ii as a goddess who relishes the thrill of combat, and is reflected in iconography (see my chapter above) which depicts her wielding a mace-axe above her head in readiness to strike, a pose adopted by the kings of Egypt and many of the deities of the ancient Near East,¹¹⁰ although Anat is shown seated (on a throne?) rather than standing in the traditional pose.

El then answers her from within his palace. Some have seen in this reference to El in his ‘seven chambers’ || ‘eight closed rooms’ a description of El hiding in fear within his palace (e.g. Cassuto 1971 101) and interpret this passage as a depiction of the humbling of El who is bullied into granting her request (van Selms 1954 114, Kapelrud 1969 65, Oldenburg 1969 87, Cassuto 1971 101). However, perhaps we should interpret the seven || eight rooms motif as a literary portrayal of the remoteness of El, not in geographical location, but in terms of his separation from the profane. Moreover, there appears to be no textual support for the assumption that El is bullied into submission; in fact his answer is lost in a lacuna whilst his behaviour subsequent to the threats of Anat does not portray a god who is gripped by fear. El simply asks for Anat’s request, at which point she lapses into the same speech of flattery and supplication that we find later on the lips of Athirat (1.4.iv.40f.).

The enigmatic reply of El to Anat’s threats, *yd’tk bt kanšt || kin bilht qlšk*, has been used as evidence to support the androgynous gender of Anat. De Moor (*ARTU* 17; cf. Dijkstra and de Moor 1975 193) translates “I know you, my daughter, (I know) that you are like a man, || (and) that among goddesses you scorn is unequalled” and explains this by asserting that like other well-known goddesses, Anat had androgynous traits (Dijkstra and de Moor 1975 193, *ARTU* 17 n.91). However,

¹¹⁰For a classic example of this smiting pose from Ugarit, see the *Baal au foudre* stele (RS 4.427) in Yon (1991 294f. and fig. 6).

there is nothing in the overall context of this passage that compels us to understand El's answer in this way, whilst the acceptance of *kanšt* as a denominative verb is hindered by the absence of an ug. noun **anš* 'man' (Walls 1992 85). The interpretation of *kanšt* against the background of hb. אָנִשׁ (see my notes to the text) meaning 'unstoppable, uncontrollable' fits the context of this passage much better and also provides us with a more coherent bicolon. Anat bursts in on El's domain and immediately threatens his life without giving any reason. El then comments on the temperament of Anat, she is the most uncontrollable of goddesses, then asks her what she wants from him. At this response, Anat calms down and commences her formal request; this is slightly different from the situation we find in 1.18.i where Anat appears to include her request immediately after the threats we also find in 1.3.v, so that El does not need to ask her what she wants, he simply grants her wish. However, this is not what seems to happen here in 1.3.v since in the next tablet we find Anat and Baal approaching Athirat in order for her to obtain El's permission for Baal, indicating that Anat's mission failed.

3.3.2.7. *KTU* 1.4.ii.21 - 26

The final column of text 1.3 narrates the sending of a message to Kothar-and-Khasis who, we are told, resides at Memphis. Unfortunately the text breaks off just as the message of Baal is about to begin, and we are unable to know for certain what it was. However, text 1.4.i begins (after a lacuna of around 20 lines) with the complaint of Baal that he has no house like the gods, followed by a detailed description of Kothar making a number of items for Lady Athirat of the sea (line 22). I accept the position adopted by many (e.g. Gibson 1984) that the beginning of text 1.4 is a continuation of 1.3, evidence for which is seen in the theme of a message sent to Kothar, and this would seem to confirm the opinion that Anat's request was denied by El and that Baal must now approach the Creatress of the gods (*qnyt ilm*: line 23) in order for her to approach El on his behalf.

Athirat was at the shore of the sea washing some clothing and thinking about sexual intercourse with her husband El (Wiggins 1993 44f.). She then spots the approach of Baal and Anat at which she reacts with a fit of anxiety, using the formulaic description we found in Anat's reaction to the approach of Gupan and Ugar in 1.3.iii (see above). The cause of her anxiety is described in lines 21-26.

21) <i>tšū. gh. w tšh*</i>	She lifted up her voice and cried:
[. i]k* 22) <i>mgy. aliyn. b*[l]</i>	Why has Valiant Baal come?
23) <i>ik. mgyt. b[t]l*t</i> 24) <i>'nt.</i>	Why has Maiden Anat come?
<i>mḥsy h*m*[. m]ḥs</i> 25) <i>bny.</i>	Are my smiters come to smite my son(s)?
<i>hm*[. mkly. s]b*rt</i> 26) <i>aryy</i>	Are they [to finish off] the company of my kinsfolk?

This reaction of Athirat raises the question of why she should fear the approach of Baal and Anat. Her reasoning is that they may attack her children,¹¹¹ and this is rationalised by de Moor (*ARTU* 44) who argues that Athirat's fear is a result of Yam's very recent demise at the hands of Baal and Anat, although he bases his argument on his own arrangement of the tablets placing text 1.2 immediately before 1.4. De Moor appears to be followed in small measure by Wiggins (1993 50) who points out that this episode occurs after Yam's defeat by Baal (although he does not follow de Moor's arrangement of tablets 1.1-1.6) and that since Athirat "is in some way closely associated with the sea", she becomes anxious for the safety of her other children (compare Baal's actions in 1.6.v.1-4).

While the observation about Yam's defeat may indeed be valid, I believe there is an even more pressing threat to the children of Anat. We have seen above that Anat's opening words to El in 1.3.iii.19f. contained a threat against the children of El if he does not comply with her wishes. The very fact that Baal and Anat must now approach Athirat would indicate that Anat's demands were not met, and thus her

¹¹¹The form *bny* in line 25 could indicate a singular or plural subject, but its parallelism with the following [*s]brt ary*y would suggest a plural.

threat against El's children (and therefore against Athirat's children) remains outstanding. Perhaps this contributes to the fear that Athirat feels on seeing the approach of this bellicose pair.¹¹²

3.3.2.8. KTU 1.4.iii.23 - 35

After her initial reaction of fear, Athirat sees the glint of gold and rapidly reassesses her situation; she rejoices (*šmḥ*) and calls to her servant, giving him some commands the meaning of which are lost in the damaged ending of column ii. Column iii describes the approach and arrival of Anat and Baal.

23) <i>aḥr. mgy. aliyn. b'l</i>	Then, Valiant Baal arrived,
24) <i>mgyt. btl. 'nt</i>	Maiden Anat arrived.
25) <i>tmgnn. rbt[.] a*trt ym</i>	They petitioned ¹¹³ the Lady Athirat of the sea,
26) <i>tḡzyn. qnyt ilm</i>	they entreated ¹¹⁴ the Mother of the gods.
27) <i>w t'n. rbt. atrt ym</i>	And Lady Athirat of the sea answered:
28) <i>ik. tmgnn. rbt 29) atrt. ym.</i>	Why do you petition Lady Athirat of the sea?
<i>tḡzyn 30) qnyt. ilm.</i>	Why do you entreat the Mother of the gods?
<i>mgntm 31) tr. il. d pid.</i>	You should both petition the Bull El, the merciful,
<i>hm. ḡzm 32) bny. bnwt</i>	or entreat the Creator of Creatures.
<i>w t'n 33) b*tl. 'nt.</i>	And Maiden Anat answered:
<i>nmgn 34) xm. rbt. atrt. ym</i>	We shall [petition] Lady Athirat of the sea,
35) <i>[n]ḡ*ḡ*. qnyt. ilm</i>	we shall entreat the Mother of the gods,
36) <i>[] nmgn. hwt</i>	[then (?) ¹¹⁵] we shall petition him.

¹¹²*Toul's* (182) suggestion (followed by Margalit 1980 31) that the Hittite myth of Elkunirsha (cf. Hoffner 1990) provides the key to a proper understanding of Athirat's reaction in the Baal cycle not only brings with it a whole new set of problems (Wiggins 1993 151f.), but is superfluous in light of the numerous acts of aggression carried out by Baal and Anat against the children of El and Athirat in various passages.

¹¹³'Petition' is the suggestion of Wiggins (1993 54) who follows *CML2* (150) 'Importune' cf. ar. *majana*. Compare *MLC* (574) 'fête, treat well' cf. hb. *ḡḡ* aram. *maggān*, ar. *majjānu*.

¹¹⁴Cf. hb. *ḡḡ* ar. *ḡaḏā* 'lower eyes' with meaning of 'entreat' (*CML2* 155), 'to honour, bribe' (*MLC* 606).

¹¹⁵Restoring [*aḥr*] (*CML2* 58).

Here we see Baal and Anat petitioning for Athirat's support in Baal's quest to build himself a palace. It is not necessary to understand these actions of Baal and Anat as an indication that they needed the permission of Athirat (*TOuI* 183), but simply that they needed her to change El's mind (Wiggins 1993 55). There does not appear to be a repetition of Baal's complaint addressed to Athirat as we find in 1.3.iv.47 addressed to Anat, in 1.3.v.38f. addressed to El, and in 1.4.i.9f. addressed to Kothar. Immediately after the presentation of gifts, the narrative continues with a banquet scene after which the text breaks off and there is a gap of around seven lines, followed by a few graphemes at the end of lines 52 and 53. We might argue that Baal's complaint is contained in this lacuna, but the few graphemes that remain oppose this view. It is impossible to know whether his complaint has been lost in the 12 lines missing from the beginning of column iv, and since we cannot be certain of this either, it is possible that Athirat does not need reminding of Baal's complaint because, as the wife of El, she would be well aware of Anat's previous attempt at obtaining El's permission. A comparison may be drawn with the later episode in 1.6.i.32f. in which Anat undergoes the formulaic journey to El's abode but seems to address herself to El and Athirat; and indeed, El's initial reaction on hearing the news of Baal's death is to invite Athirat to choose one of her sons to become king. Thus we see that the abode of El is that of his wife also, a fact clearly seen in Baal's complaint which parallels El's house with Athirat's house; the idea that Athirat lives apart from El (e.g. van Selms 1954) has been convincingly refuted by Wiggins (1993).

As I suggested above, Athirat's initial reaction to the approach of Baal and Anat may be the result of the threat of Anat to seize El's children, which is therefore a threat against the sons of Athirat. This, coupled with the fact that there is no indication that Baal's complaint is spelled out to Athirat, suggests that Athirat was present at Anat's petition to El, which might explain her reaction to the presentation of gifts to her; she wonders why they are presented to her and not El himself. Anat's

reply explains that they will petition El *after* they have petitioned Athirat. There is a certain amount of ambiguity in this reply; the verbs *tmgnn* and *tǵzyn* (lines 25-26) are best taken as 3rd person imperfect which indicates that both Baal and Anat petition Athirat, and after Athirat's questioning of their motives, Anat uses the verbs *nmgn* and *nǵz* (restored) which we take to be 1st person forms, again indicating the fact that Baal and Anat together petition Athirat. However, the final line of Anat's answer contains the verb *nmgn* which again appears to be 1st person, but this time it is more difficult to ascertain who are intended as the subjects of this verb. We could accept that once again, Baal and Anat are the subjects - they are the ones who will petition El. But it is obvious that this is not the case within the context of the narrative. It is perhaps better to understand that the group of subjects for this verb has expanded in this last line to include Athirat; in other words, the message of Anat is this: 'We (Baal and Anat) petition you (Athirat), then we (including Athirat) will petition El'. Perhaps the presence of the names of the three principle characters after line 36 are to be taken as part of Anat's reply, forming a list of this new expanded group fighting for Baal's planning permission.

It is interesting to note Anat's role in all of this. She has already acted as intermediary between Baal and El, but her mission failed. Now we notice that in the remaining text Baal does not actually speak to Athirat, and it is possible that Anat has acted as intermediary between Baal and Athirat. It would be tempting to see her role in this part of the Baal cycle as one half of a 'double buffer' between Baal and El. Baal has to persuade Anat to plead on his behalf, Anat has to petition Athirat, and Athirat has then to persuade El, almost as if this were some kind of divine chain of command. To put this another way, at this point it seems that Anat and Athirat stand at the interface between Baal the Prince, Lord of the earth (*zbl b'l arš*), and El at the

centre of the cosmos.¹¹⁶ There is a saying that behind every great man stands an even greater woman; perhaps the same can be said for the gods of Ugarit!

In column iv we read of the preparations for the journey to El's house. In line 18 we read that Anat followed behind Athirat who was placed on a she ass whilst Qodesh-and-Amrur strode in front. The text which describes Athirat's arrival and subsequent petitioning of El has been dealt with recently by Wiggins (1993 55-63). It appears that the entreaty of Athirat is successful and El gives his permission for the building of Baal's palace to commence.

3.3.2.9. KTU 1.4.v.20 - 27

Immediately after El's speech granting Baal permission to build his palace, Athirat utters a eulogy on the wisdom of El, then calls for the news to be told to Baal (1.4.v.12). In lines 20f. we find Anat bringing the good news to Baal.

20) <i>šmḥ. btlṭ. 'nt.</i>	Maiden Anat rejoiced.
<i>td's 21) p'nm.</i>	She stamped her feet,
<i>w tr. arṣ</i>	and the earth trembled.
22) <i>idk. l ttn. pnm</i>	Then she set her face,
23) <i>'m. b'l. mrym. ṣpn</i>	towards Baal of the heights of Saphon,
24) <i>b alp. šd. rbt. knm</i>	over a thousand miles, ten thousand leagues.
25) <i>ṣḥq. btlṭ. 'nt.</i>	Maiden Anat laughed.
<i>tšū 26) ḡh. w tṣḥ.</i>	She lifted up her voice and cried:
<i>tbšr b'l 27)</i>	Receive good news, Baal!
<i>bšrtk. yblṭ</i>	Good news I bring you.

It is uncertain whether Anat was present with Athirat when the latter pleaded Baal's case (van Zijl 1972a 120). For supporting evidence we could turn to 1.4.iv.43f. where we find 1st person plural pronominal suffixes and verb forms spoken by Athirat, and the testimony of 1.4.iv.18 where Anat follows behind Athirat's mount.

¹¹⁶Compare the comments of Walls (1992 180).

Counter to this view is the fact that Anat is nowhere mentioned by El in his greeting at the goddess' arrival, and the fact that the speech of Athirat is identical to that of Anat in her address to El in 1.3.iii.29f. which suggests that the verb forms have no specific dependence on this particular context.

Whether or not we accept that Anat was actually present at the meeting of Athirat and El, and I am not certain the target audience would have thought too much over this point, the response of Anat to the good news (from the point of view of Baal at least) portrays the goddess in a role with which we have become familiar throughout the theme of Baal and his palace; that of intermediary between El (and perhaps Athirat also) and Baal. Here, Anat rushes to give Baal the glad tidings, and the narrator informs us twice of her excitement; in line 20 Anat rejoices (*\$mh\$*) and in line 25 she laughs (*\$hq\$*). We can compare Anat's reaction to the news with that of El in text 1.6.iii for example, where on discovering that Baal is alive, El rejoices (*\$mh\$*) in line 14 and laughs (*\$hq\$*) in line 16. What is more, the role of Anat as a herald of good news is also found in text 1.10.iii.32f. where she announces to Baal the birth of their son (see below). There we find the use of the verb *bšr* in a very similar context and in both cases we find the following reaction from Baal, (y)*\$mh\$ aliyn b'l*, 'Valiant Baal rejoiced'.

After Anat announces the news to Baal she no longer appears to play any role in the narrative as it progresses with a description of the actual construction of the palace and the installation of Baal in his new home. It seems that within the theme of Baal's palace, Anat's role is as an intermediary between Baal and El, and that she is no longer important once her task is accomplished and Baal has his planning permission.

3.3.3. The Conflict of Baal and Mot

Anat's role in the third major theme of the Baal cycle is once again closely bound up with the fate of Baal. Unlike the previous theme in which she interacts positively with El only through the good offices of Athirat, here Anat and El interact directly in a positive and fruitful manner, although she still appears to be the intermediary between El and Baal.

3.3.3.1. KTU 1.5.v.18 - 23

The following lines appear at the stage in text 1.5 at which Baal descends into the nether world with his retinue. In the preceding lines it appears that someone instructs Baal and most commentators now propose that this is Shapshu,¹¹⁷ on the basis of line 12f. where we read that Baal is to go to 'the rocks of my grave' (*gr knkny*). This is understood as the place where Shapshu descends into the underworld every night.

18) *yuhb. 'glt. b dbr.*

prt 19) b šd. šhlmmt.

*š*k*b 20) *m*nh. šb'. l šb'm*

21) *t*š*['ly. tmn. l tmnym*

He loved a heifer in the pasture,

a cow in the steppe at the shore-of-death.¹¹⁸

He lay with her seventy seven times,

she caused him to mount¹¹⁹ eighty eight times.

¹¹⁷Other suggestions include El or Anat; see van Zijl (1972a 173).

¹¹⁸See *SP* (186f.), *TOuI* (249 n.1) for a discussion of this term. Margalit (1980) believes this place to be comparable to the idyllic Elysian Fields of Greek myth, used exclusively for honoured guests of Mot, and from where Baal is devoured by Mot when overcome by desperation for food; most commentators take this as a euphemism for the underworld (*CML2* 66, *MLC* 535), but I prefer Smith (1986) who sees the location of Baal's demise at the interface between the land of the living and that of the dead.

¹¹⁹Compare *KTU* 1.10.iii.5 where Baal mounts ('ly) Anat, and the footnote there.

22) w[]rn. w tldn mt
 23) al*[iyn b']l*. šlbšn

And she conceived and gave birth to a young male,¹²⁰
 [Valiant Baal (?)] clothed him...

Many questions are generated by this short text which impinge on our understanding of the Baal cycle as a whole, and it would be impossible to examine adequately all the implications within the scope of the present work. I wish to concentrate on the question of whether, as some scholars have suggested, the copulation between Baal and the cow in these lines should be understood as a mating of Baal and Anat (e.g. Wyatt 1990 75), or whether the cow bears no relationship to Anat.

Recent analysis of the sexuality of Anat (e.g. Day 1991 and 1992, Walls 1992) has concluded that Anat and Baal are never described as having sexual intercourse in any of the Ugaritic texts, and therefore that this text cannot possibly depict the mating of Anat and Baal in theriomorphic imagery. However, I believe that there is sufficient evidence in texts 1.10 and 1.13, and possibly in 1.11,¹²¹ to suggest that Anat *does* mate with Baal, which legitimises our original question.

These texts contain many references to bovines apart from Baal and Anat, for example in text 1.10 these are the wild bulls (*rumm*) and cows (*arh*, *ypt*) who are hunted by Baal and watched by Anat as they mate and give birth. However, in text 1.13.22 there is a clear reference to Anat as a cow; she is addressed by the vocative *l arh* || [*ybmt*] *limm*. Further possible references to Anat as a cow (*arh*) occur in 1.10.iii.19 and 23, where after the intercourse between Baal and Anat, there is a

¹²⁰Cf. akk. *māšu*, *maššu* 'young male' (TOu1 249 n.m, CML2 152, MLC 586, Walls 1992 128), rather than 'twin' (SP 187, ARTU 78). Compare also akk. *mēsu* (*mēšu*) 'to crush, squash, trample, destroy, overwhelm' and with passive meaning, used of destruction of human and animal life (CAD M/II.35). Perhaps we could take *mt* as cognate to this akk. root and see in this the name of Baal's offspring, designating his fate?

¹²¹For a detailed discussion of these texts, see my chapter on the myths not attributed to Ilmilku.

description of the cow giving birth and then going up to Saphon to break the news to Baal, and 1.13.29-30 where we find *'nt arḥ b'l* as a parallel to *'nt*.

In this text, however, we find no mention of *arḥ*, rather we find *'glt* (heifer) paralleled by *ypt* (cow). This should caution us against simply assuming that the cow in this text must be Anat, since we only ever find Anat with the title *arḥ*. The idea that texts 1.10, 1.11 and 1.13 are related in some way to the events narrated in 1.5.v cannot be supported on the basis of the narrative context since here in 1.5.v, Baal is on his way to the nether world when he mates with the heifer whereas in text 1.10, Baal goes up (*'ly*) to Saphon after he mates with Anat, which is followed by Anat herself going up to Baal to announce the birth of his child. Text 1.11 is damaged to such an extent that we cannot be certain of its broader context, and text 1.13 appears to contain nothing that would suggest a link with the context we find in 1.5 and the conflict of Baal and Mot. If anything, the opening lines of 1.13 suggest a context similar to that of 1.3.

Turning from evidence outside the Baal cycle, we can see that even within the context of the narrative itself there are strong reasons to reject an interpretation of this text as a copulation between Baal and Anat. In column iv, after word has been brought to El of Baal's death and he has initiated the proper mourning rites, Anat goes in search of his body. We read in 1.5.vi.25f. that Anat searched for Baal's body, and when she found it, she too carried out the appropriate mourning rites before returning to El to confirm Baal's death. This makes sense if we assume that Anat did not know where Baal was to be found, and her reaction upon finding his body only serves to reinforce the opinion that the mating scene did not include Anat in the guise of the heifer. In light of the above, we conclude that text 1.5.v.18f. was not a mating scene between Anat and Baal, but between Baal and a cow. Suggestions for the significance of this event vary tremendously. A typical example from the fertility cult school is the explanation of van Zijl (1972a 174) who believes that Baal's descent into

the underworld is symbolic of the burial of seed, and that Baal's return to life occurs when the seed sprouts in the spring; Baal therefore symbolises animal and plant fertility. I find this kind of explanation unconvincing, if only because of the large number of assumptions we must make about the nature of Ugaritic theology that have no support at the surface level of the texts, and the idea that we can 'explain' a text by inferring some cultic act that must lie behind it.

3.3.3.2. *KTU 1.5.vi.11 - 1.6.i.31*

On the resumption of the text in column vi we find two messengers bringing news of Baal's death to El. The identity of these messengers is lost to us, but there are certain similarities with the two *glmm* (divine messengers)¹²² in 1.19.ii.28f. who bring the news of Aqhat's death to Danil, prompting him to initiate a search for the remains of Aqhat; in the present text the two messengers bring news of Baal's death to El, at which point Anat goes in search for Baal's body.

11) <i>apnk. ltpn. il</i> 12) <i>d pid*</i> .	Thereupon, the compassionate, merciful god,
<i>y*r*d. l ksi.</i>	came down from his throne,
<i>y*tb</i> 13) <i>l hdm*</i> .	he sat on his footstool,
<i>w* l. hdm.</i>	and from his footstool,
<i>ytb</i> 14) <i>l arš*</i> .	he sat on the ground.
<i>y*š*q. 'mr</i> 15) <i>un. l r*i*šh.</i>	He poured ashes of affliction ¹²³ on his head,
<i>'pr. pltt</i> 16) <i>l. qdqd*h*</i> .	dust of wallowing ¹²⁴ on his crown.
<i>lpš. yks</i> 17) <i>mizrtm.</i>	For clothing he dressed ¹²⁵ in a loin-cloth. ¹²⁶

¹²²*Contra* CML2 (116 n.3) who assumes that they must be servants of Aqhat who survived the attack of Anat and Yatpan.

¹²³'*mr* || '*pr* may be a phonetic variant of '*pr* on the same lines as *špš* / *šmš* (MLC 601, and raised as a possibility by Fenton 1969 69 n.21). Otherwise cf. hb. עָרַר (SP 191, Margalit 1980 132, ARTU 80), ar. *ġamar* 'dirty, putrid' (TOu1 250 n.d), ar. *ġamīr* (Dietrich and Loretz 1986 105).

¹²⁴Cf. hb. שָׁרַר 'rolling (in dust)' as an act of mourning (SP 192, TOu1 250 n.e, CML2 155, MLC 610, Dietrich and Loretz 1986 106).

¹²⁵I take *yks* to be 3ms imperfect of *ksy* 'cover oneself' (Fenton 1969 69, TOu1 250, CML2 73, Margalit 1980 129, MLC 567). Dietrich and Loretz (1986 107) take the root as *nks* cf. *akk*.

<i>ḡr. b abn 18) ydy.</i>	His skin with a stone he scraped, ¹²⁷
<i>psltm. b y'r*</i>	his locks ¹²⁸ with a razor,
<i>19) yhdy. lhm. w d*q*n</i>	he lacerated ¹²⁹ his cheeks and his chin. ¹³⁰
<i>20) yltl. qn. dr'h*[.]</i>	He ploughed his arm-bone,
<i>yhr̄ 21) k gn. ap lb.</i>	he harrowed his chest like a garden,
<i>k 'mq*. yltl 22) bmt.</i>	like a valley he ploughed his torso.
<i>yšu. gh[.] w ysh</i>	He lifted up his voice and cried:
<i>23) b'l. mt.</i>	Baal is dead!
<i>my. lim.</i>	What of the people?
<i>bn 24) dgn.</i>	Son of Dagan! ¹³¹
<i>my. hmlt.</i>	What of the multitude? ¹³²
<i>atr 25) b'l. ard. b arš.</i>	After Baal I would descend into the nether world.
<i>ap 26) 'nt. tllk.</i>	Also Anat went out,
<i>w tšd. kl. ḡr 27) l k*bd. arš.</i>	and searched every mountain at the midst of the earth,
<i>kl. gb' 28) l* k*b*d. šdm.</i>	every hill at the midst of the steppe.
<i>tmḡ. l n'm*[y] 29) [arš.] dbr.</i>	She arrived at Pleasure, [land] of pasture,

nakāsa 'cut off, fall' and translate "Das Kleid schnitt er ab zu einem Schurz", which is an intriguing possibility in the light of *KTU* 1.19.i.36.

¹²⁶Cf. ar. *mi' zaratu* (*SP* 192, *CML2* 150, *MLC* 574 'vest, ritual tunic', Dietrich and Loretz 1986 107, *ARTU* 80), but taking *lpš* as a variant of hb. שִׁבְיָה 'sackcloth' and *mizrtm* as a reference to 'loins' (Kapelrud 1969 84, *TOu1* 250).

¹²⁷Cf. ar. *wadā* (*CML2* 148, *MLC* 558, Dietrich and Loretz 1986 108), see the discussion of lines 17-18 in Margalit (1980 132).

¹²⁸Thus Kapelrud (1969 84), cf. akk. *pasālu* (*TOu1* 251 n.i, *MLC* 611), which fits the poetic parallelism better than 'flint' cf. hb. חֶבֶד 'hew' (*SP* 193, *CML2* 156, *ARTU* 80). *TOu1* (251 n.i) points to the two locks of hair visible on the Baal stele.

¹²⁹Cf. ar. *hadda* (*MLC* 540), but 'shaved' cf. *hadā* (*TOu1* 251 n.h, *CML2* 145).

¹³⁰*SP* (193) translates "side whiskers and beard" taking *dqn* 'beard' cf. phoen. *zqn* hb. זִקְנִי akk. *ziqnu*. In this case he takes the dual *lhm* ('cheek, jaw' cf. ar. *lahy* hb. לַהֵי akk. *lahū*) as 'side whiskers'. This leads him to postulate an androgynous character for Anat. However, de Moor (*ARTU* 80) later translates 'cheeks and chin' in light of the criticisms of Loewenstamm (1982). For a survey of the term 'chin' in Semitic languages see Marcus (1977). For Ugaritic he concludes (58) that the lexeme *dqn* can mean both 'beard' and 'chin'. However, he rejects the translation 'side whiskers and beard' in this passage on the basis of the verb *hdy* which as a parallel to *ltl* is a term for ploughing rather than 'cutting off'.

¹³¹An alternative understanding of *bn dgn* is offered by Wyatt (1980 and 1992).

¹³²Compare the translation given by Wyatt (1992 412f.).

ysmt. šd 30) [šhl]mmt.

tm*[g.] l b'l.

np*[l] 31) [l a]r*s*

[. lpš]. tks. miz*[rtm]

KTU 1.6.i

1) l* b'l

2) ḡr. b ab (abn). td.

p*s*l*tm*[. b y'r]

3) thdy. lhm. w dqn.

t*[tlt] 4) qn. dr'h.

thrt. km. gn* 5) ap lb.

k 'mq. tlt. bmt

6) b'l. mt.

my. lim.

bn dgn

7) my. hmlt.

atr. b'l. nrd 8) b arš.

'mh. trd. nrt 9) ilm. špš.

'd. tšb'. bk

10) tšt. k yn. udm't.

gm 11) tšh*. l nrt. ilm. špš

12) 'ms* m'. ly. aliyn. b'l

13) tšm'. nrt. ilm. špš

14) tšu. aliyn. b'l.

l ktp 15) 'nt. k tsth.

tš'lynh 16) b šrrt. šp'n (spn).

tbkynh 17) w tqbrnh.

tštnn. b hrt 18) ilm. arš.

tšbh. šb'm 19) rumm.

kgmn. aliyn 20) b*'l.

tšbh. šb'm. alpm

Delight, the steppe at the [shore] of Death.

She came upon Baal,

fallen to the earth.

[For clothing] she put on a [loin-cloth].

Concerning Baal

Her skin with a stone she scraped,

her locks [with a razor],

she gashed her cheeks and chin,

she [ploughed] her arm-bone,

she harrowed like a garden her chest,

like a valley she ploughed her torso.

Baal is dead!

What of the people?

The son of Dagan!

What of the multitude?

After Baal we shall go down to the nether world.

With her went down the lamp of the gods, Shapshu.

When she was sated with crying,

had drunk tears like wine,

she cried aloud to the lamp of the gods, Shapshu:

Pray, load upon me Valiant Baal!

The lamp of the gods, Shapshu, heard.

She lifted up Valiant Baal,

onto the shoulders of Anat she surely set him.

She brought him up¹³³ to the recesses of Saphon,

she wept over him, and she buried him,

she put him in a grave of the gods of the nether world.

She slaughtered seventy wild bulls,

as a funerary offering¹³⁴ for Valiant Baal.

She slaughtered seventy oxen,

¹³³I take the following verbs as 3fs imperfect with 3ms object suffix *-nh*. Alternatively, we could take them as 3fp Imperfect forms with 3ms object suffix *-h* (both forms attested by *UT*), in which case, Baal is buried and mourned over by Anat and Shapshu (c.g. *ARTU* 83). However, the action of slaughtering *tšbh* is performed by a single female (Anat) which might suggest we take these verbs as singular in keeping with what follows.

¹³⁴Cf. akk. *kamānu* (*MLC* 533). De Moor (*SP* 199) takes *kgmn* as the particle *k* 'because' with a 3ms perfect passive D-stem or passive participle of G-stem cognate with eth. *gammāna* 'to profane, defile'. He translates "because Ba'lu the Almighty had been defiled", arguing that Baal's holiness had been profaned through death (*ARTU* 83 n.405).

21) [kg]mn. aliyn. b'l	as a funerary offering for Valiant Baal.
22) [t]b*h. sb'm. sin	She slaughtered seventy sheep,
23) [kg]m*n. aliyn. b'l	as a funerary offering for Valiant Baal.
24) [t]b*h*. sb'm. aylm	She slaughtered seventy stags,
25) [kgmn.] aliyn. b'l	[as a funerary offering] for Valiant Baal.
26) [t]bh. s]b*'m. y'lm	[She slaughtered] seventy mountain-goats,
27) [kgmn. al]i*y*n. b'l	[as a funerary offering] for Valiant Baal.
28) [t]bh. sb'm.] h*mrn	[She slaughtered seventy] asses,
29) [kgm]n*. ali*yn[.] b**l*	[as a funerary offering] for Valiant Baal.
30) [xhh. tšt bm. *[]	[Her sacrificial offerings] ¹³⁵ she put in the [furrows (?)], ¹³⁶
31) []zrh. y*bm. l ilm	[her (?)] as a gift ¹³⁷ to the god(s).

In this episode El initiates the mourning for Baal. He climbs down from his throne, sits on the ground, wears appropriate clothing, pours ashes on his head, and gashes his face and chest, all actions which are familiar to us from Hebrew literature (Margalit 1980 134). Kapelrud's (1969 87) observation that "it is quite obvious that it is not the intention of the narrative to indicate that El felt any personal sorrow for Baal" seems a gross misinterpretation of the narrative at his point. The reaction of El here to the news of Baal's death is narrated using identical terms as that of Anat, and later we see El enthusiastically rejoice at the news that Baal is alive (1.6.iii.14f). Kapelrud's dismissal of El's reactions as being those of the initiator of appropriate actions for the audience of a fertility cult drama relies too heavily on his earlier interpretation (1952) of the confrontational relationship between El and Baal and the assumption that the Baal cycle is primarily the text of a cultic drama.

El's mourning ritual is followed by Anat going in search for Baal's body. She searches every mountain and hill at the centre of the earth until she reaches the

¹³⁵Restoring [db]hh (MLC 224).

¹³⁶Restoring *[nt] 'furrows' (e.g. Margalit 1980 142, MLC 224).

¹³⁷Variant plural of yhb, cf. hb. 𐤁𐤁 ar. whb (Margalit 1980 142). For a discussion of lines 30-31 see del Olmo Lete (1982 65f.).

fields at the Shore of Death where she comes upon Baal's body. Anat then undergoes the exact same mourning ritual that we saw for El, the only difference being in the person of the verbs used. As I noted above, the controversy between de Moor and Loewenstamm over whether Anat wears a beard appears to have dissipated if we are to judge from de Moor's translation in *ARTU*, who now follows the line advocated by Loewenstamm.

Anat declares, in the same terms as El, that she would follow Baal into the nether world. However, the text has just narrated Anat's arrival at Baal's body (lines 30-31) and we are left wondering on the meaning of Anat's declaration in line 7, 'After Baal we shall go down to the nether world'. Margalit (1980 139) sees two possible solutions; either Anat arrives at the place where Baal's body was found by the two messengers but which has now gone 'deeper' into the underworld,¹³⁸ or the section from line 31 to 1.6.i.8a is couched in stereotypical language which describes the despair of a mourner.

After her initial reaction, Anat calls upon Shapshu to lift Baal's body onto her shoulders, after which she carries him back to Saphon where she buries him. After this, Anat performs a great sacrifice for Baal, killing large numbers of animals as funerary offerings for him. This formal burial stands in contrast with the mythic description of Baal's descent into the nether world, and serves not only to emphasise the stress laid upon the importance of a correct burial in the ancient world (Margalit 1980 140), but also to the disparity between the physiological reality of death which leaves a body, and the mythical view of death as a journey into another place.

¹³⁸By which he means that Baal's favoured status indicated by his 'pasturage' in the Ugaritic Elysian Fields has now been destroyed by Mot devouring Baal in a moment of intense hunger. However, my reading of the text finds no evidence to support this interpretation of Baal's fate.

The inclusion of Shapshu in this episode is generally accepted on the basis that Shapshu is thoroughly familiar with the nether world because of her nightly journey through the realm of the dead (Margalit 1980 156). In the cultic texts we also find a relationship between Shapshu and Anat who appear to be included in the group of 'strong ones' (*gtrm*) who have a close connection with the funerary cult (see my chapter on cultic texts).

Some interpreters believe that this is not Baal's body that Anat buries, but the product of his mating with a cow before he went down to the nether world (*CML2* 15f., *ARTU* 79). However, even if we are inclined to believe that Mot could be fooled by such a ruse, in my opinion it is not likely that Anat could mis-identify the body as that of her brother Baal when in fact it was that of his son. If it is objected that this argument places too heavy a literal translation upon the text, it should also be noted that the text itself gives no clues that the body which Anat comes across, laments over, carries up to Saphon and buries, is not that of Baal but of a substitute. Even if the characters themselves are convinced that they have the body of Baal, we might expect the narrator at some point to indicate to the audience that in fact the body was that of Baal's substitute. I would, therefore, object to the idea that Baal never actually dies in the Baal cycle.

Further, the claim that these actions of Anat are mythic precedents for a cultic drama enacted by the women at Ugarit as part of the seasonal celebration of Baal's absence and return (e.g. Kapelrud 1969 86f., *SP* 200f., *ARTU* 82 n.398) cannot be supported from the text alone, but are rather based on the assumption of an intimate connection between myth and ritual which has little foundation in the texts themselves.

3.3.3.3. KTU 1.6.i.39 - 43

After Anat had buried Baal's body, she goes to El's abode to announce that Baal was indeed dead, for up to this point it seems that El had only the word of the two messengers as evidence for Baal's death. Anat delivers the following speech.

39) <i>tšū. gh. w tšh.</i>	She lifted up her voice and cried:
<i>tšmḥ ht</i>	Let her now rejoice!
40) <i>atrt. w. bnh.</i>	Athirat and her sons,
<i>ilt. w šb</i> 41) <i>rt. aryh.</i>	the goddess and the band of her kinsfolk.
<i>k mt. aliyn</i> 42) <i>b'l.</i>	For Valiant Baal is dead!
<i>k ḥlq. zbl. b'l</i> 43) <i>arṣ</i>	For perished ¹³⁹ is the Prince, Lord of the earth!

This surprising statement of Anat that Athirat should rejoice over the news that Baal is dead has been taken by many as an indication of a rivalry between Baal and the sons of Athirat (Margalit 1980 142). It is true that we find references in the Baal cycle itself to Baal as a potential or actual slayer of Athirat's children (e.g. 1.4.ii.21f., 1.6.v.1f., and the struggle of Baal and Yam) and this would not be an unreasonable assumption to make. However, Wiggins (1993 65f.), following the work of Maier (1986) has suggested that Athirat is called upon to rejoice in the exercise of her authority in her capacity as 'Queen Mother' (*rabītu*). I think this offers the key to the correct interpretation of this text. Anat is not referring to a rivalry or hatred between Baal and Athirat, but announcing a new cycle of kingship. Baal is dead, mourning rituals have been carried out, his body has received a proper burial and the appropriate sacrifices have been carried out. At this point it must be recognised that the old king is dead and a new king must be installed; a case of 'The king is dead! Long live the king!'.¹³⁹

¹³⁹Cf. akk. *ḥalāqu* (CML2 147, MLC 552). Compare the use of this verb (transitive ?) in the description of Aqhat's demise in KTU 1.18.iv.42.

3.3.3.4. KTU 1.6.ii.4 - 37

After the episode of Athtar's installation as king, column ii takes up the narrative after a large lacuna of around 30 lines, at which point we find Anat brooding over the death of Baal. Finally she decides on a course of action.

4) ... [ym, ymm] 5) y'tqn.	[A day, and two days] passed.
w r*[hm, 'nt] 6) tngth.	The girl ¹⁴⁰ Anat sought him,
k lb*: a*r*[h] 7) l 'glh.	like the heart of a cow for her calf,
k lb. ta[t] 8) l imrh.	like the heart of a ewe for her lamb,
km. lb. 'n*[t] 9) atr. b'l.	so was the heart of Anat after Baal.
tihd. m*[t] 10) b sin. lpš.	She grasped Mot by the hem ¹⁴¹ of his garment,
tšqn*[h/n] 11) b qš. all.	she restrained him by the edge of his robe.
tšu. gh. w t*[š] 12) h.	She lifted up her voice and cried:
at. mt. tn. ahy.	You, Mot, give up my brother!
13) w 'n. b*n. ilm. mt.	But divine Mot answered:
mh 14) taršn. l bilt. 'nt	What is it you are asking me, Maiden Anat?
15) an. itlk.	I went around myself,
w ašd. kl 16) gr. l kbd. arš.	I searched every mountain at the heart of the earth,
kl. gb' 17) l kbd. šdm.	every hill at the heart of the steppe.
npš. hš*rt 18) bn. nšm.	My appetite was needing human beings,
npš. hmlt. 19) arš.	my appetite the multitude of the earth.
mgt. l n'my. arš 20) dbr.	I arrived at Pleasure, the land of pasture,
ysmt. šd. šhlmm	Delight, the steppe by the Shore of Death.
21) ngš. ank. aliyn b'l	It was I who approached Valiant Baal,
22) 'dbnn ank. imr. b py	it was I who made him a lamb in my mouth.
23) k lli. b tbrn qy (qny).	Like a kid in the opening ¹⁴² of my gullet,
htu hw	he was carried off.
24) nrt. ilm*. špš. šhrrt	The lamp of the gods, Shapshu, became hot, ¹⁴³
25) la. š*mm. b yd. bn ilm. mt	the heavens grew weak from the hand of divine Mot. ¹⁴⁴

¹⁴⁰See my discussion on this title above.

¹⁴¹*TouI* (259 n.d) points to akk. *sānu*. Greenstein (1982) relates ug. *sin* with akk. *sissiktu(m)*, hb. and aram. *knp*.

¹⁴²Cf. ar. *tabratu* (MLC 640).

¹⁴³Cf. ar. *ṣaḥara* (CML2 156, MLC 614). *SP* (114) connects this verb to ar. *iṣḥarra* 'to become dust-coloured, brownish yellow or reddish'. De Moor (*ARTU* 88 n.428) believes this to be a reference to the sirocco, attempting to reduce the myth to his postulated seasonal interpretation.

26) *ym. ymm. y'tqn.*
*l ymun 27) l yrh*m.*

rhm. 'nt. tngth

28) *k lb. arh. l 'glh.*

k lb 29) tat. l imrh.

km. lb 30) 'nt. atr. b'l.

tihd 31) bn. ilm. mt.

b hrb 32) tbq'nn.

b htr. tdry 33) nn.

b ist. tšrpnn

34) *b rhm. tthnn.*

b šd 35) tdr'. nn.

*širh. l tikl 36) 'šr*m*.*

mnth. l tkly 37) npr[m].

*š*ir. l šir. yšh*

A day, two days passed,

from days to months.

The girl Anat sought him.

Like the heart of a cow for its calf,

like the heart of a ewe for its lamb,

so was the heart of Anat after Baal.

She seized divine Mot,

with a sword she cleaved him,¹⁴⁵

with a sieve she winnowed him,

with fire she burnt him,

with millstones she ground him,

on the steppe¹⁴⁶ she sowed¹⁴⁷ him.

His remains were indeed eaten by birds,

his limbs were indeed finished off by fowl.

Flesh to flesh cried out.¹⁴⁸

These lines reflect two sides of Anat's character that have become familiar to us in the Baal cycle: on the one hand she is pictured as heartbroken at the loss of Baal, on the other hand she is ferocious and merciless in her destruction of Mot.

¹⁴⁴For an understanding of lines 24-25 as a tricolon, see del Olmo Lete (1978 37f.).

¹⁴⁵For this as expressing the act of threshing, cf. *SP* (209).

¹⁴⁶Compare Mot's own description of his treatment at the hand of Anat in *KTU* 1.6.v.18-19 where he says he was sown (*dr'*) in the sea (*ym*). Bordreuil and Pardee (1993 65) comment on the irony of such treatment; Mot, who is the last vanquished enemy of Baal is dispersed in Yam, the first vanquished enemy of Baal.

¹⁴⁷The literal meaning of this verb *dr'* is 'to sow (seed)', i.e. an agricultural term (Margalit 1980 159).

¹⁴⁸*TOu1* (260 n.m) cannot believe that the root is *šh* 'cry out' and instead relates it to ar. *naḏaḥa* 'to spurt out, gush forth' and hb. מציח II. Margalit (1980 160) suggest an ar. cognate *šh(h)* 'heal, return to health' which, he feels, explains the fact that after so thorough a destruction, Mot returns to fight Baal later in the same tablet; in other words, this passage emphasises the indestructibility of Death. However, I prefer to accept the root *šh* 'cry out', and understand this colon as an example comparable to that we find in Gen. 4.10 where the blood of Abel cries out from the ground.

Anat finally seizes Mot and pleads with him to let Baal return to her (line 12). Attempts to interpret Anat's motives at this point vary from overwhelming grief (Walls 1992 182) to assumptions that Mot, who is the grain, must die in order for Baal to return to life (Gray 1965 67, Bowman 1978 82). The surface language of this episode certainly points to grief as the primary motive for Anat's actions, and in the absence of any corroborative evidence for the fertility/vegetation interpretation, it seems best to accept what the narrative is telling us.

Mot's reply has been interpreted as a regretful admission that he simply had to devour Baal (who was already dead) because of a lack of humans on which to feed (Margalit 1980 155), but I would prefer to see his reply as a boast that he was the one who finished Baal off. This would then give us a striking parallel with Yatpan's boast to Pughat that he was the one who murdered Aqhat, and this comparison would add weight to the argument that in the missing text at the end of the Aqhat narrative Yatpan dies by the hand of Pughat, echoing the events of 1.6.ii. Here, Mot boasts of his slaying of Valiant Baal¹⁴⁹ to Baal's 'sister' (*aht*) and eventual avenger, obviously unaware of the consequences that will follow, whilst in 1.19.iv.58f. Yatpan boasts of his slaying of Aqhat to Aqhat's sister (cf. 1.19.iv.34 where Pughat calls Aqhat *ahy* 'my brother'), unaware of her real identity. Unfortunately, the consequences of his boasting are unknown to us. Given this structural parallelism between this passage and that of the Aqhat narrative, perhaps we are to see in Anat's actions a revenge killing of her brother's murderer (Greenstein 1982 218). Walls (1992 183) emphasises that this is not a blood-feud murder, but an example of the passionate and unrestrained character of the goddess; however, there may well be elements of both in this passage. In the Aqhat narrative Pughat acts after

¹⁴⁹The irony of Mot's choice of epithet of Baal should not be lost to us; 'Valiant Baal' (*aliyn* from a root *l'y* 'be strong': Wyatt 1992 405) becomes a 'kid' in the face of Mot's aggression.

the formal burial of Aqhat, and in text 1.6.ii, Anat has already buried Baal before she approaches Mot. In this light, I disagree with Margalit's (1980 155f.) proposal that this episode has been displaced and should actually take place while Anat is still in the nether world but before she comes upon Baal's body.

The unusual treatment of Mot by Anat has attracted an enormous amount of discussion. The cluster of agricultural terminology has led many to interpret this episode as an agrarian rite in which Anat desacralises the new grain crop, making it available for profane use (Kapelrud 1969 60, Day 1985 16 n.40). Miller (1973) writes that Anat "scattered him [Mot] to fertilize the earth". On the other hand, others see in her actions a metaphor describing the utter destruction of Mot at the hands of Anat (Loewenstamm 1963 and 1972, Oldenburg 1969 87, Walls 1992 183).¹⁵⁰

De Moor takes the middle ground between these two positions. He asserts that this is not a rite of grain (*SP* 213) and that the surface language of the narrative describes the utter destruction of Mot. In this view he seems to be followed by Healey (1983). However, he goes on to assert that myths usually have an "underlying symbolic meaning" (*ARTU* 88 n.430) and that since the actions of Anat are clearly linked to the treatment of grain, it is probably the case they reflected some seasonal ritual. Margalit (1980 161 n.2) states that he sees no allegorical meaning underlying Anat's treatment of Mot, but does not rule out a cultic *Sitz im Leben*. He believes the internal illogicality of the destruction does not arise out of narrative needs but probably stems from a cultic act in which a 'dummy Mot' was treated in this way.

¹⁵⁰The analysis of Kapelrud (1969 60) who argues that Anat did not kill Mot, "she just seized him and handled him according to her will. She prepared him for the defeat he met later, at the hand of Baal", cannot be accepted as a serious interpretation of this passage. The imagery of this episode vividly describes Mot's destruction, whether we read into this a mythic precedent for an agricultural rite or not, and any attempt to force the texts into a modern Western logical tradition will do violence to the meaning of the myths. Compare Oldenburg (1969 87 n.3) who states, "It was very difficult to annihilate a god. In spite of being slain, ground, dispersed, burned, and eaten Môt arose after the completion of the cycle of seven years."

3.3.3.5. KTU 1.6.iii.22 - iv.24

The destruction of Mot at the hands of Anat ends column ii, but there is a lacuna of around 40 lines at the beginning of column iii which obscures the connection between Anat's aggression against Mot and El's dream that Baal is alive. However, it is obvious from what follows that Anat's slaying of Mot has effected the release of Baal from the underworld, although I am not sure how far we should follow Walls' (1992 184f.) analysis of this process which claims that, "the creative potential stored within her [Anat] as an adolescent maiden... unknowingly serve[s] to restore fertility and life to the world". After El has dreamt he speaks to Anat, which may indicate that she is the one addressing El at the beginning of column iii.

22) *gm. y*š*ḥ. il. l btl* 23) '*nt.*

*šm'. l btl. 'nt**

24) *rgm*. l nrt. il (ilm). špš*

Column iv

1) *pl. 'nt. šdm. y špš*

2) *pl. 'nt. šdm[.] i*l.*

*yštk 3) b*l. **nt. mḥrtt*

4) *i*y. aliyn. b'l*

5) *iy. zb*l. b'l. arš*

El cried aloud to Maiden Anat:

Listen, O Maiden Anat!

Speak to the lamp of the gods, Shapshu:

Search¹⁵¹ the furrows of the fields, O Shapshu!

Search the furrows of the fields of El!¹⁵²

May Baal be visible¹⁵³ in the furrows of the plough land.

Where is Valiant Baal?

Where is the Prince, Lord of the earth?

¹⁵¹For a discussion of this term see *SP* (220), van Zijl (1972 207f.), *TOu1* (262 n.g). I prefer the solution of Margalit (1980 170) who (following a suggestion of Ginsberg from 1932) suggests a cognate with ar. *ply* 'search' akk. *palālu*. Compare akk. *palālu* 'überwachen' (*AHW* 813).

¹⁵²The lexeme *il* could be taken as the divine name, El (*SP* 221, *CML2* 78), as a parallel vocative to *yšpš* giving 'O god!' (*MLC* 229), but since Shapshu is feminine at Ugarit we would expect *ilt*; or we could take it as a superlative adjective, 'the vast steppe' (Wyatt, unpubl. transl.).

¹⁵³There are great difficulties with this verb. *SP* (221) suggests 3ms Gt-stem of *škn* 'establish for oneself' (cf. *CML2* 78 'settle on'). *TOu1* (262 n.g) sees El as the subject of this verb and translates "c'est à Anat des champs que t'adjoint El". *MLC* (229) poses this as a question "¿te hicieron 'Señor' de los surcos de la arada?". I prefer to follow Margalit (1980 170, again following Ginsberg) who takes this as a Gt-stem of the root *sky* cf. hb. כָּשָׁה, glossed as 'visible'. This is a possibility acknowledged by *SP* (221) although ultimately rejected on the grounds of narrative coherence; however, it does provide us with a suitable meaning within the context of Shapshu searching for Baal.

- 6) *ttb'. btl't. 'nt*
 7) *idk. l ttn. pnm*
 8) *'m. nrt. ilm. špš*
 9) *tšū. gh. w tšh*
 10) *tħm. tr. il. abk*
 11) *hwt. ltpn. ħtkk**
 12) *pl. 'nt. šdm. y špš*
 13) *pl. 'nt. šdm. il[.]*
*y*š*t*k** 14) *b'l. 'nt. mħrth**
 15) *iy. aliyn. b'l*
 16) *iy. zbl. b'l. arš*
 17) *w t'n. nrt. ilm. šp*š**
 18) *šdyn. 'n. b. qbt[.]*
*t*x(?)*¹⁵⁶ 19) *bl* lyt. 'l. umtk*
 20) *w abqt. aliyn. b'l*
 21) *w t'n. btl't. 'nt*
 22) *an. lan. y špš*
 23) *an. lan. il. yğx[]*
 24) *tğrk. šx[]*
- Maiden Anat departed,
 She set her face,
 towards the lamp of the gods, Shapshu.
 She lifted up her voice and cried:
 Message of Bull El, your father,
 a word of the Compassionate, your sire.
 Search the furrows of the fields, O Shapshu!
 Search the furrows of the fields of El!
 May Baal be visible in the furrows of the plough land.
 Where is Valiant Baal?
 Where is the Prince, Lord of the earth?
 And the lamp of the gods, Shapshu, answered:
 Pour out¹⁵⁴ sparkling wine from a vat,¹⁵⁵
 Let the children of your family bear along¹⁵⁷ a
 wreath,¹⁵⁸
 and I shall seek Valiant Baal.
 And Maiden Anat answered:
 Wherever, O Shapshu,
 wherever (you go) may El protect you (?),¹⁵⁹
 may [] protect you (?)

Once again we have a search for Baal, but here he is to be brought back alive. Like the previous search in 1.6.i.7f. we find Anat and Shapshu, only this time it

¹⁵⁴Dividing *šd + yn*, cf. aram. *šēdā* (CML 148, TOuI 264, CML2 158, MLC 627).

¹⁵⁵Cf. hb. *בָּרַךְ* (CML2 156, MLC 616).

¹⁵⁶Examining a recent colour slide of this tablet reveals that the surface layer has become detached at the end of this line leaving only *šdyn. 'n. b.q* as certain. CTA transcription reads *qbt[*, and unfortunately the plate (XIII) is of no use at this point.

¹⁵⁷Cf. hb. *בָּרַל* hiph., translated by 'wear' (CML2 78) 'carry, bring' (SP 224, MLC 230).

¹⁵⁸Cf. hb. *לְיָדָהּ* (SP 224, CML2 150), or 'suite, retinue' (MLC 572). The response of Shapshu is cryptic to modern readers, and the suggested translation is given only tentatively. I find Margalit's (1980 171) solution to these lines unconvincing.

¹⁵⁹MLC (230) takes *il* as a title of Shapshu, 'O God!' as a parallel to *yšpš* (cf. his interpretation of lines 12-13 above). If we read the final *yğ[]* as a 3ms verb from *nğr* 'watch, protect' cf. hb. *נָצַר* ar. *naẓara* (CML2 153, MLC 591, ARTU 93) then we have a wish of protection for Shapshu on her search for Baal.

appears that Anat is the intermediary between El and Shapshu, passing on his instructions, rather than engaging in the search itself.

As with the episode of Anat killing Mot, these lines have often been interpreted as part of a seasonal pattern. Margalit (1980 161) writes,

The story at this point becomes transparently allegorical. His [Baal's] return coincides with the beginning of the spring rains and the first sprouting of the grain sown in the furrows.

De Moor's (*SP* 222) interpretation of this part of the myth is dependent on understanding the verb *pl* to mean 'dried up, cracked' (cf. ar. *ḥll*). However, given the context of Shapshu being commissioned to find Baal, I prefer to see *pl* cognate with ar. *ply* akk. *palālu* (see my notes to the text) 'search'. This then obviates the need to see here an allegory of the severe heat conditions of the Syrian summer; rather, Shapshu is asked to search for Baal on her nocturnal journey through the underworld.

In this text Anat's role is that of intermediary between El and Shapshu. Anat and Shapshu had earlier retrieved Baal's body and buried him, but now it seems that Shapshu has to go alone through the underworld to find Baal, and that Anat plays the role of messenger only. Here it is possible to make some distinction between the realm of Shapshu and that of Anat. As a warrior goddess, Anat is often involved in the immediate effects of death, seen in the mutilation of bodies in battle, her destruction of Mot, and her search of the fields on the shore of death, which is probably the land between the living and the dead. Shapshu, on the other hand, plays her role when Baal has been buried and time has elapsed. Baal is now ensconced in the underworld and this is Shapshu's domain.

When Baal returns from the land of the dead, Anat disappears from the narrative; presumably her role in the narrative has come to its conclusion. This is similar to what we found in the theme of Baal's palace where she drops out of the

plot as soon as she has relayed El's permission. In the present theme of Baal and Mot, Anat's main role is seen in her actions of burying Baal and killing Mot, which appears to precipitate the return of Baal, although the damaged state of the text does not allow us to be too precise on this point.

3.4. THE AQHAT NARRATIVE (KTU 1.17-1.19)

The Aqhat narrative as it exists for us today extends over three tablets.¹⁶⁰ Anat's role in the Aqhat narrative, although significant to the plot as the agent of Aqhat's death, is limited to a pivotal (but central! Parker 1989 140) position; from the text that remains to us, she does not appear before 1.17.vi, and after 1.19.i is only alluded to as the cause of Aqhat's death (Gibson 1974 67); her characterisation, however, is played upon by Pughat. Although the scenes in which she tries to persuade Aqhat to give her his bow,¹⁶¹ and her later murder of him, make a great impression on the reader, the narrative seems to use her as the means to rid Aqhat from the plot and move the narrative forward to Danil's loss and mourning and the blood revenge of Pughat. However, this is not to suggest that little can be learned about Anat's character from this narrative (*contra* Bowman 1978 263). A careful study of her role within this narrative will enhance our picture of this Ugaritic goddess, who is cast in the role of an indomitable huntress.

¹⁶⁰For a treatment of the narrative in its entirety, see *inter alia* MLC (327f.), Margalit (1989), Parker (1989 99f.).

¹⁶¹Almost certainly a composite bow. On the technical aspects of this weapon in general see Albright and Mendenhall (1942), Sukenik (1947), Yadin (1963 6f.), Rausing (1967), McLeod (1970), Gaunt (1983), Klopsteg (1987), Bergman and McEwan (1988), Margalit (1989 303f.), McEwan and Miller (1991), Brown (1993). Watson (1976 372) draws attention to a passage in the (An)Zu myth which describes the component parts of such a bow.

My approach to the text differs from that of Walls (1992 186f.) who asserts from the outset that Anat's encounter in this narrative is "charged with sexual tension". In my reading of the text, Aqhat himself has a limited role to play in the narrative; he is the answer to Danil's prayers but like Yassib in the Keret narrative, he is responsible for his own downfall. Walls' approach to the narrative is exemplified by many other scholars who elucidate particular features of this narrative by recourse to comparative mythemes, the most famous being the confrontation between Ishtar and Gilgamesh. Whilst this approach can prove fruitful to the extent that it broadens our understanding of themes common to both traditions, there is a danger of subjugating a particular narrative under a general *mélange* of details culled from autonomous narratives, which results in the details specific to each narrative becoming submerged under the weight of comparative material assembled. This is seen in Walls' (1992 197f.) treatment of the Aqhat narrative in which he devotes almost half of his discussion to its comparison with the Gilgamesh Epic.¹⁶² One of his first observations is that "it is surely not mere coincidence that Anat offers Aqhat the very thing for which Gilgamesh is seeking". Whilst it may be the case that it is not mere coincidence, perhaps this agreement could be the result of a common human concern for death and immortality which is often worked out in myths, as a narrative in which immortality is lost to a mortal through ignorance or plain stupidity (see the comments of Dijkstra 1979 201). Many comparisons are made between Ishtar's proposal to Gilgamesh to become her lover and his refusal, and the broken line in *KTU* 1.18.i.24 which is read by many to be a proposal of Anat for Aqhat to become her lover. However, unlike the Gilgamesh Epic in which this scene is central to an understanding of the confrontation

¹⁶²Compare also the approach of Dijkstra (1979) who uses Tammuz/Dumuzi material to elucidate the myth, and Parker (1989 113f.) who draws on a wide range of comparative material. I am not condemning this approach to the material *per se*, but wish instead to focus attention on the details of the goddess' character which we can draw out from a reading of the *Ugaritic* text specifically.

between the two characters, in the Aqhat narrative it is the bow around which Anat and Aqhat oppose each other. If there is any substance to the argument that Anat proposes to Aqhat, and I believe that there is little to commend this view, then it is used as a ploy to get Aqhat's bow and is not central to the conflict between these two characters. In fact, the view that Anat proposes to Aqhat seems to be based more on the model of Ishtar and Gilgamesh than on the text itself.

Walls (1992 186f.), following the work of Hillers (1973), approaches the Aqhat narrative on the basis that the bow of Aqhat is symbolic of his virility; Anat's appropriation of his bow is tantamount to castration! However, considerable doubt has been cast on this approach by Dressler (1975) who concludes (220),

the bow is a symbol of masculinity, used in the Aqhat-Epic for the masculine activity of hunting. Beyond this surface-level meaning one may venture, with great caution, to suggest a deeper level consisting of sociological implications (agriculture versus hunting) or a still deeper level expressing correspondences between human heroes and heavenly prototypes. But here one enters the field of speculation.

If we examine the text, Anat does not deprive Aqhat of his bow but of his life, which although could be taken as a negation of his masculinity, it is perhaps better taken as exemplifying the opposition between life and death. Given the considerable difficulties faced in drawing valid comparisons between disparate myths, the approach adopted in the present study will be to obtain a picture of Anat's character from the text itself rather than relying on comparative material to fill in the gaps. In this way, it is hoped to form an image of the goddess that is peculiarly Ugaritic, perhaps even 'Aqhatian'!

3.4.1. Anat's Attempt to Obtain Aqhat's Bow

It is not until the sixth column of the first tablet that we find Anat mentioned, apparently involved in a feast. Up to this point we have been told of Danil's plight and of its resolution in the birth of Aqhat, as well as his subsequent

presentation of the contentious bow by Kothar. Aqhat's bow catches her eye and she attempts to persuade Aqhat to give her it.¹⁶³

3.4.1.1. KTU 1.17.vi.10 - 16

- | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|---|
| 10) [|] ¹⁶⁴ <i>b nši 'nh[.] w * t*phn*</i> | ... lifting her eyes she saw it, |
| 11) [|] <i>l. kslh. k b*r*q</i> | ... its string like lightning |
| 12) [|] <i>x y*(?) ḡ *p*(?).¹⁶⁵ thmt. brq</i> | ... deep ¹⁶⁶ lightning |
| 13) [|] <i>tšb. qšt. bnt¹⁶⁷</i> | ... she coveted ¹⁶⁸ the bow ... |
| 14) [|] <i>*nh. km. btn. yqr</i> | ... her eye ¹⁶⁹ (?) like the snake who hisses ¹⁷⁰ |
| 15) [|] <i>l* arṣ.</i> | ... to the earth |
| <i>ksh*. tšpkm 16) [l 'pr.</i> | | her cup she spilled [to the dust]. |

The tablet is broken at the left hand edge at this point, and from examination of a colour slide of the tablet it is apparent that approximately 10 signs

¹⁶³The text is very broken at this point and many suggestions are made for restorations. The most adventurous are those of Margalit (1989) and ARTU (236f.).

¹⁶⁴From a colour slide of this tablet it is estimated that approximately 10 signs are missing from the beginning of these lines.

¹⁶⁵This reading is very uncertain; compare that of CTA (83) *kyḡd*. Examining a colour slide of the tablet shows that the traces after the ḡ are very faint, although the group directly after the ḡ looks more like a *d* than KTU's suggested '*p* despite Margalit's (1989 183) assertion that '*p* is preferred "on the grounds of alliterative compatibility". Possible cognates are hb. 𐤍𐤔 ar. '*wḏ* although for an Ugaritic ḡ we might expect an ar. ḡ, and less likely hb. 𐤍𐤔 ar. '*zz* with *z* rather than *d*. Perhaps it could be related to ar. *ḡadda* 'to fester (of wounds)' and IV 'to hasten', or ar. *ḡḏw* 'to feed, nourish', or possibly akk. *ezēzu* 'to be furious, fierce', *uzzuzu* 'to become furious' (CAD 427). The great difficulties of reading this lexeme and the damaged context make any suggestion speculative.

¹⁶⁶'Ocean, deep' (CML2 159). TOu1 (430 n.1) suggests a verbal noun related to hb. 𐤍𐤔𐤕 'make a noise' which they translate as 'le fracas de la foudre'.

¹⁶⁷Dijkstra and de Moor (1975 185) take *bnt* as a substantive from the verb *bny* meaning 'creation, product'. Margalit (1981 89) restores *bnt[ih]* as a preposition + inf. constr. *nt* + *-h* and compares ar. *nata'a* 'bulge, protrude', and ar. *ntw* (1983 84). Margalit (1989 183) claims to read *h* in the doubled ruled lines separating the columns, but my examination of a colour slide of the tablet fails to establish this.

¹⁶⁸Cf. syr. *šbā* akk. *šabū* (TOu1 430 n.m, CML2 156, Margalit 1981 90, MLC 613).

¹⁶⁹This reading is objected to by TOu1 (431 n.n).

¹⁷⁰Cf. ar. *qarra* (CML2 157, MLC 620).

are missing from each of these lines.¹⁷¹ In this case, it is difficult to establish the prosodic division of the text, and I present the text by lines as they appear on the tablet. It is only when we reach line 15 that we can see a possible bicolon which appears to describe Anat throwing her cup to the floor.

It is apparent from the remaining text that the opening lines of column vi describe a banquet scene which appears to open a new chapter in the narrative (Parker 1989 116), although its significance is hard to determine. Gibson (*CML2* 24) cautiously describes the scene as “a feast (at which apparently Aqhat is present)”, whereas for Margalit (e.g. 1989 299) the scene is a ‘coming of age party’ for the adolescent Aqhat at which he is presented with the bow, symbolising his attainment of manhood. His argument (300) for the existence of a warrior-aristocracy in which Anat is held in high esteem and into which Aqhat is to be initiated is intriguing but ultimately unproved. Equally difficult is *ARTU*’s (236 n.78) assertion that the banquet places the scene at the New Year Festival. It is better to take a more cautious approach in our interpretation; this does appear to be a banquet at which Anat¹⁷² is present and at which she sees Aqhat’s bow, but exactly what the banquet celebrates and who is present it is impossible to establish.

Despite the damaged nature of the text, there are some clues to the nature of Anat that are still discernible. In line 13 we find the verb *tšb* which is generally taken to mean ‘covet’ alongside the object ‘bow’ (*qšt*), and these two words introduce the audience to the ensuing tension between Anat and Aqhat in the following narrative, culminating in her destruction of both Aqhat and the bow in

¹⁷¹For detailed estimates see now Margalit (1989 178) although I am less than confident about his restorations and emendations of the text.

¹⁷²Note that the remaining text does not show her name, but the feminine form of the verbs, and especially line 13 which appears to show Anat wanting to obtain the bow, all point to this goddess.

1.18.iv - 1.19.1. Anat spies the bow of Aqhat and appears to be overcome with desire for it, dropping her cup to the floor before she addresses herself to Aqhat. Exactly why she should want Aqhat's bow is not explicitly spelled out; perhaps we are to believe that it had some extraordinary appearance or ability described in the broken lines 11-12. Margalit's (1989 336) explanation that Anat's behaviour is due to her role as a huntress and as such she covets this ultimate piece of hunting equipment overlooks the fact that she uses a bow in 1.3.ii and the same objection can be made to Watson's (1977a 73) comments. Walls' (1992 190) overtly Freudian interpretation of Anat's behaviour as a severe case of 'penis envy' is an interesting analysis of Ugaritic myth, but as a theory is loaded with too many contemporary presuppositions of its own to prove a useful category for interpreting the character of a goddess of second millennium B.C. Ugarit. The answer probably lies in the fact that the weapon was made by the craftsman god Kothar-and-Khasis and therefore was endowed with a special quality that triggered Anat's envy.

The phrase 'her eye (?) like a snake who hisses' in line 14 is very probably a simile describing Anat's reaction, since the narrative has progressed from a description of the bow in lines 11-12, to Anat's reaction at seeing it. We cannot argue from this passage which describes the snake-like behaviour of Anat for a special relationship between Anat and snakes. We know that deities in the ancient Near East could be portrayed holding snakes, especially the Qedeshet figure; however, as we saw above, there is no direct iconographic evidence that would support a link between Anat and serpents. We should perhaps see the simile as just that (Margalit 1989 302); a comparison between some aspect of Anat's behaviour (connected with her eyes?) and the wide-spread beliefs concerning snakes, demonstrated in mythical figures such as Apepi who threatened the Egyptian sun-god each night, or the snake in the Hebrew 'Garden of Eden' myth who persuades Eve to eat from the tree of knowledge, or the snake in the Gilgamesh Epic who stole the plant of rejuvenation from the hero

Gilgamesh (Dalley 1991 119). From Ugarit itself we find Anat as the slayer of *btn* in 1.3.iii.41 which demonstrates that such negative feelings concerning serpents were very deep-seated and wide-spread. A comparison of Anat's reaction as snake-like would evoke in the mind of the audience all these negative associations and act as an indicator of Anat's subsequent role in the narrative.

The picture that emerges from this scene is of a goddess who is susceptible to the volatile emotion of jealousy. The use of the verb *šb* to convey the burning desire she felt for the bow, and the serpentine imagery used to describe some aspect of the goddess (unfortunately lost in the lacuna) all indicate a certain 'human' quality to her character, albeit in an exaggerated form; this is something the audience could understand.

3.4.1.2. *KTU 1.17.vi.16 - 45*

The text moves immediately from her display of jealousy over Aqhat's bow to her address to the hero with the specific intention of obtaining the bow for herself.

tšu. gh.] w tšh.*

šm'. m' 17) [l aqht. ġzr.

*i]r*š. ksp. w atn*k*

18) [*hrš. w aš]l*h*k.*

w tn. qštk*. *m* 19) [btl.t.] *n*[t.]*

*q*š'tk. ybmt. li*m*m*

20) *w* y'n. aqht. ġzr.*

adr. tqbm 21) b lbnn.*

*adr. gdm. b ru*mm*

[She lifted up her voice] and cried:

Hear, I pray, [O hero Aqhat!]

Ask for silver and I shall give it to you,

[gold and I shall grant] it to you.

And give your bow to [Maiden Anat],

your arrows to *ybmt limm*.

But hero Aqhat answered:¹⁷³

Most splendid of ash from Lebanon,

most splendid¹⁷⁴ of sinew from wild bulls,

¹⁷³Watson (1976 372f.) has drawn attention to a similar list in the myth of (An)Zu (see Foster 1993 I.477 lines 60f.) and points out that this confirms *qnm* as 'reeds' for the arrows rather than as part of the bow construction itself.

¹⁷⁴I take this to be the plural adjective in construct as a superlative (*TOu1* 431, *CML2* 108). See Dijkstra and de Moor (1975 186f.) for discussion; their objection to this interpretation

22) *adr. qmnt. b y'lm.*
*mtn*m 23) b 'qbt. tr.*
adr. b gl il. qnm
 24) *tn. l ktr. w hss.*
*yb'l. qst. l 'n*t*
 25) *qs't. l ybmt. limm.*
*w t'n. btl*t 26) 'nt.*
irš. hym. l aqht. g'zr
 27) *i*rš. hym. w atnk.*
bl mt 28) w ašlhk.*
ašsprk. 'm. b'l 29) šnt.
'm. bn il. tspr. yrhm
 30) *k b'l. k yhwy.*
y'sr. hwy.
y's 31) r. w yšqynh.
*ybd. w yšr. 'lh 32) n'm*n*(?)[.*
w t]'nynn.
*ap ank. ahwy 33) aqh*t*[. g'z]r*.*
w. y'n. aqht. g'zr
 34) *al. tš*r*gn. y btlm.*
dm. l g'zr 35) šrgk. hhm.

most splendid of horn from mountain goats,
 tendons from the hocks of a bull,
 most splendid of, from the reed-bed¹⁷⁵ of El, reeds.
 Take to Kothar-and-Khasis.
 Let him make a bow for Anat,
 arrows for *ybmt limm*.
 And Maiden Anat answered:
 Ask for life O hero Aqhat!
 Ask for life and I will give it to you,
 immortality¹⁷⁶ and I will grant it to you.
 I will cause you to count with Baal the years,
 with the son of El,¹⁷⁷ you will count the months.
 Like Baal, when he makes alive,¹⁷⁸
 He invites¹⁷⁹ the living one,¹⁸⁰
 he invites and he gives him drink.
 The gracious one chants and sings over him.
 And she answered him:
 So even I will give life to hero Aqhat.
 But hero Aqhat replied:
 Do not lie¹⁸¹ O Maiden,
 because to the hero your lie is spit.¹⁸²

is the construction of line 23 where we find *bglil* interposed between the construct and genitive, but this may be a deliberate poetical variance on the construction of the previous cola.

¹⁷⁵Cf. ar. *gīlu* (TOuI 431, CML2 155, MLC 606).

¹⁷⁶Literally *bl* 'not' + *mt* 'death'.

¹⁷⁷Grammatically this could also be translated 'sons of El' but I take *bn il* as the (singular) parallel of 'Baal' himself.

¹⁷⁸Dijkstra and de Moor (1975 187) defend the position of de Moor (e.g. *SP*) in seeing this as a reference to Baal's revivification, celebrated in 1.3.i as they read the text. CML2 (109) translates "As if he were Baal when he comes alive". MLC (377) "Como Balu de cierto da la vida".

¹⁷⁹Cf. eth. 'aššara 'invited to a feast' (CML2 155, MLC 605), 'serve food' (TOuI 154 n.j).

¹⁸⁰MLC (377) takes *y'sr.hwy* to be dittography.

¹⁸¹Cf. ar. *saraga* (TOuI 432 n.z, CML2 159, MLC 633).

¹⁸²I prefer to translate *hhm* with a sense close to its cognate akk. *haḥū* or *haḥḥu* 'spittle, slime' (CAD 6.28). This may refer to a practice of showing contempt by spitting (a common

mm (mt).¹⁸³ *uḥryt. mh. yqh*

36) *mh. yqh. mt. atryt.*

spsg. ysk 37) [*l*] *r*is.*

hrš. l zr. qdqdy

38) [*]* *m*t. kl. amt.*

w an. mtm. amt

39) [*ap. m*] *tn. rgmm. argm.*

qštm 40) [*]* *m*hrm.*

ht. tšdn. tint 41) [*bh*

What does a man get as his end?

What does man get at his conclusion?

Glaze¹⁸⁴ is poured over his head,

quicklime¹⁸⁵ on top of my crown.¹⁸⁶

[And] the death of all I shall die,

and I shall most certainly die.¹⁸⁷

And again with words I would speak:

The bow is of warriors,

Are womankind¹⁸⁸ now to hunt [with it]?

practice in many cultures today) and illustrate the contempt in which Anat is held in the eyes of Aqhat; it also an ironic foreshadowing of Aqhat's life oozing from his body like 'spittle' (*itl*) in 1.18.iv.25. Others look to this cognate and translate along the lines of 'filth, rubbish' (Dijkstra and de Moor 1975 189, *CML2* 147), or 'muddy pit' (*MLC* 551). For other suggestions see Margalit (1989 306 n.14).

¹⁸³I find Margalit's (1989 125) stichometrical division of the text and his analysis of *mm* as a parallel to *ḥhm* (cf. akk. *mummu* "denoting a pointed wooden instrument used for removing fungus") unconvincing.

¹⁸⁴Cf. hit. *zapzaga(y)a* (Dijkstra and de Moor 1975 190, *CML2* 153, Margalit 1983 85, *MLC* 596, Margalit 1989 316f.).

¹⁸⁵Cf. ar. *ḥuruḍu* (*TOu1* 433 n.c 'cendre', *CML2* 146, *MLC* 549). Dijkstra and de Moor (1975 190) equate *hrš* with the more familiar *hrš* 'gold' and postulate a funerary ritual involving artificial lapis-lazuli and a gold death-mask to commemorate the features of the deceased. However, note the caution of Renfroe (1992 118f.).

¹⁸⁶*TOu1* (432 n.b) notes the plastered skulls found in Neolithic Jericho, but believes that this practice cannot be thought to have continued into the Bronze Age. Margalit (1983 84f., 306, 1989 316f.) states that the key to a proper understanding of this text is a comparison with the plastered skulls found in pre-pottery Neolithic B Jericho and the Upper Jordan Valley, his 'Neolithic Hypothesis'. He contends that Anat's treatment of Aqhat's body 1.19.i (he understands the text to mean that she incised his gums and extracted his teeth) corresponds to the archaeological evidence. However, apart from the fact that his translation of 1.19.i leaves much to be desired, any suggestion that the narrative itself has an ancestry stretching back over three millennia (at least!) to the Neolithic should be rejected (Dijkstra and de Moor 1975 190). Rainey (1971 154) puts the case well when he writes, "the arbitrary adoption of Neolithic artefacts, and utterly unique ones at that, into the cultural milieu of Late Bronze Ugarit is a gross violation of sound hermeneutical principles".

¹⁸⁷I take the phrase *mtm amt* as inf. abs. with enclitic *-m* and 1st singular imperfect (*UT* 9.27).

¹⁸⁸I agree with Margalit's (1989 310 n.27) observation that the choice of this word rather than the more usual *at* is probably an emphasis on the 'weak nature of women', and hence a heightened insult to Anat's 'virility'.

The scene here between Anat and Aqhat can be divided into two parts, each containing an attempt of Anat to obtain the bow, and a refusal by Aqhat to part with it. As the narrative progresses from the first part to the second, the stakes are raised considerably, by both characters.

Anat begins by offering Aqhat silver and gold in exchange for the bow. This is not simply an act of purchase; silver and gold established both kings and gods in their relative positions of power and prestige as we see in various passages: in 1.2.i.35 Yam intends to obtain not only Baal's subservience, but also his gold (*pd*), in 1.3.iii.47 Anat boasts of defeating Baal's enemies and getting her hands on their gold (*hrš*), in 1.4.v.18 Baal is permitted to build his temple of silver and gold (*ksp w hrš*), and in 1.14.i.-ii El offers Keret silver (*ksp*) and gold (*hrš || yrq*) in response to his supplication. We also see the high prestige placed on goods made using silver and gold in 1.4.i.25f. where we read of the gifts prepared for Athirat using these precious metals, and her delight at seeing the glint of silver and gold (1.4.ii.26f.). There can be no doubt that silver and gold were the status symbol of kings and deities alike, and thus Anat's offer to Aqhat had implications far beyond a simple purchase. However, she demonstrates a lack of understanding of Aqhat's mentality - in much the same way as we find with El and Keret. Her offer of status fails to entice Aqhat to hand her his bow, and his subsequent reply, in which he outlines the materials needed to construct such a weapon, with the exhortation of line 24 to take the materials to Kothar-and-Khasis, is a firm but subtle refusal to part with his divine gift.

The second part of this scene raises the tension of the narrative; Anat now offers Aqhat immortality. This escalation of Anat's offer is reflected in the fact that it is expanded upon and described in many more cola than the original offer of silver and gold (Parker 1989 112). Exactly what her offer entails is a matter of debate; we need only compare the translations of some recent works such as *TOuI* (432), *CML2*

(109), *MLC* (377), and Margalit (1989 151) to observe the divergence of opinion that exists among scholars.

Dijkstra and de Moor (1975 187) focus on the phrase in lines 28-29 of counting years and months. For them, this is a reference to the annual resurrection of Baal at the New Year festival which is assumed by the authors (cf. also *CML2* 109 n.7). Just like Baal, Aqhat's life will be renewed on an annual basis, and they translate line 30 'Like Ba'lu, when he is revived', pointing to the similarity of the following lines with 1.3.i, which in turn they interpret as a feast to celebrate the revival of Baal at the New Year festival. They object to translating this line as I have chosen to do, not on grammatical grounds, but because of their theological interpretation of the text. However, de Moor's thesis (e.g. *SP*) of an annual festival celebrating the return of Baal from the underworld is tendentious (Grabbe 1976) which in turn undermines their objection to the translation presented in the present study.

Another possible interpretation of Anat's offer is that Aqhat will live eternally after his death, feasting and drinking in the presence of Baal. In text 1.113 we find that the dead kings of Ugarit are labelled *il* 'divine, god' (Kitchen 1977) and text 1.161 clearly illustrates a cult of dead kings who are referred to as *rpu* and *mlk* (Lewis 1989 5f.). From a later period we find on the Old Aramaic 'Panammuwa' inscription (*KAI* 214.17) a description of the deceased king eating and drinking with Hadad (Baal).¹⁸⁹ On this model, Aqhat would become a member of the distinguished Rephaim on his death, feasting and drinking and generally enjoying a status of deified king within that group.

¹⁸⁹Margalit (1989 313 n.7) dismisses this as exemplifying the kind of eternal life that Anat is offering to Aqhat.

On the other hand, Anat's offer has been interpreted to mean that Aqhat will never die (Margalit 1989 305 "on the Utnapištim-Adapa model"). This is certainly how Aqhat himself understands her offer. His description of what he expects to happen at his death, and his declaration in line 38b 'I shall most certainly die' reinforces this view of how he interpreted Anat's offer; he believes she has offered him immortality and he points to the fact that all humans must die, including himself.

How are we to interpret this interaction between Anat and Aqhat? Is Aqhat the innocent victim of Anat's unwarranted aggression, or is he arrogant and insensitive, fully deserving of his fate? Margalit (1989 301) characterises Aqhat and Anat thus,

Aqht is certainly not guilty of sinful hubris, as commonly thought. He is in fact something of a Promethean figure who naively, and suicidally, challenges an immoral and unscrupulous goddess who would abuse her divine privilege and shame her divine birth right by depriving a mortal lad of a cherished birthday present.

For Margalit, Aqhat's reply is a brilliant piece of rhetoric based on a 'realistic' philosophy found in wisdom literature all over the ancient Near East. He is the victim of a passionate and ill-tempered goddess who cannot control her jealousies and desires, and must obtain everything on which she sets her heart. Walls (1992 191) takes a similar view to Margalit. He believes that Aqhat's response to Anat was essentially correct: Anat is unable to grant immortal life and bows are reserved for male warriors. On the other hand, Parker (1989 139) thinks that Aqhat is guilty of hubris towards Anat, but that this is a matter of personal affront rather than some transgression against a cosmic law (so also *MLC* 362).

However, I believe the issue is not as black and white as Margalit paints it. We must remember that the narrative was intended for an audience, and within this artificial atmosphere, many subtleties could be incorporated into the text without making them explicit. Aqhat's first refusal to hand over his bow may seem rather

hazardous to an audience familiar with the temper of this goddess; external to the narrative (and thus available to the audience) is the knowledge that Anat is a formidable warrior and huntress, and to deny her her wishes could be disastrous. Aqhat's second refusal to hand her his bow on the grounds that she is lying about immortality would seem absurd to an audience quite at home with the concepts of the ancestor cult, and the cult of the divinised kings of Ugarit. Aqhat's reply that all men must die is a correct observation, but Anat's offer of immortality was not this artificial prolongation of flesh and blood, but of getting Aqhat into the highly select group of Rephaim who feasted and enjoyed a high ranking status within the Ugaritic cult. I interpret this episode as Aqhat completely missing the point of Anat's second offer which in terms of status must be equal to silver and gold in the present life! He rather cleverly points out that all men die, so that Anat's offer must be fanciful, but Anat (and presumably the audience) are well aware of the nature of an immortality spent feasting with Baal. Perhaps we should understand line 30, 'like Baal when he makes alive', as the feasting, drinking and celebratory atmosphere relate to the appointment of a deceased king to the Rephaim?¹⁹⁰

Aqhat goes one step further in his dismissal of Anat; he states that a bow is a weapon of war - for warriors, and implies that Anat, as a member of the weaker sex, should not aspire to such a weapon for hunting. This exemplifies Aqhat's foolishness in handling this goddess, for we, as the audience, know that these two functions - warfare and hunting - are precisely those in which Anat excels. This phrase not only serves to illustrate to us the close connection in the ancient world between the activities of hunting and warfare, but is the pivotal point in the relations between Anat and Aqhat. His jibe at her abilities as a huntress sets in motion a retribution that clearly illustrates Anat's abilities as the huntress *par excellence*. The audience may

¹⁹⁰Compare the views of Spronk (1986 152f.) who sees this as inclusion in the group *bn il*.

have formed the opinion that Aqhat deserves all that is coming to him; only a fool would make fun of such a figure in the ancient Near East. The narrative tension is heightened by the juxtaposition of Anat's offers with Aqhat's replies. Anat offers status on the earthly plane and Aqhat refuses her offer and tells her what she must do to have a bow made for herself. Anat then raises her offer to status in the divine realm, but Aqhat's reply is in inverse proportion to Anat's offer and escalates the tension in the narrative: not only does he accuse Anat of being economical with the truth, he adds insult to injury by ridiculing her status as warrior and huntress.

We could compare the theme of a son, who is the result of divine intervention on behalf of a son-less kingly figure, and who as a result of his own stupidity is lost to his father, with that of Yassib in the Keret narrative. There we find that *after* Keret has been revived, Yassib challenges his father's authority to reign, and thus receives a curse, which effectively cuts him off as a descendent of the old king. In each case, the father who prayed for a son, obtains his wish, then loses it because of the son's behaviour.

3.4.2. Anat's threat to Aqhat

3.4.2.1. KTU 1.17.vi.41 - 45

After Aqhat's final insult, Anat's reaction changes to a menacing threat.

g]m*. tšhq. 'nt.
w b lb. tqny 42) []
t*b. ly. l aqht. ġzr.
tḫ ly w lk 43) []

Anat laughed [aloud],
and in her heart she created ...¹⁹¹
Pay attention to me O hero Aqhat!
Pay attention to me and to you ... !¹⁹²

¹⁹¹Dijkstra and de Moor (1975 190) suggest restoring *hnp* which would fit the lacuna and match El's words to Anat in 1.18.i.17 (see below). *CML2* (109) suggests 'a plot' but with no etymology. *MLC* (379) 'y dijo'. For an Akkadian parallel to this phrase, *ikpudma libbašu lemutta* 'but he plotted evil in his heart', see Watson (1976 376).

h(?)m. l aqryk. b ntb. pš***

44) [x. b ntb. gan.

*ašq*lk. tḥt 45) [p'ny. a]tk (a)nk).*

n'mn. 'mq. nšm

If I meet you on the path of rebellion,

... on the path of pride,¹⁹³

I myself will fell you under [my feet].

Gracious one, strongest of men.

Anat's reaction to Aqhat's insults is to laugh (*šḥq*). Margalit (1989 310) imaginatively describes the scene,

Aqht concluded his speech with a rhetorical flourish which no doubt brought him a thunderous ovation accompanied by gales of appreciative laughter from the partying company. Even the frustrated goddess, now also mortally offended by the insinuated disparagement of her manly virtues, could not repress a smile on her taut face.

So according to this interpretation, Anat is impressed by the rhetorical virtuosity of Aqhat who induces her to laughter through the brilliance of his replies. However, this is not the only way of interpreting her reaction. Evidence from other texts indicates that deities laughed (*šḥq*) on receipt of good news or happy circumstance; for example, El laughs with joy at the arrival of Athirat (1.4.iv.28), Anat laughs with joy at the news of El's permission for Baal to construct his palace (1.4.v.25), El laughs when he discovers Baal is alive (1.6.iii.16). However, we also find a laughter of a more sinister kind issuing from the mouth of Anat in 1.3.ii; there she expresses her joy of combat and illustrates for us the ambivalent nature of such laughter. It is perhaps in this light that we are to understand Anat's reaction to Aqhat's insults; she is not laughing *with* him, or smiling at the sophistry of his speech, she is laughing *at* him, in anticipation of the enjoyment she is planning ('in her heart' *blb*) by hunting this human who believes himself to be superior in hunting ability to 'woman-like' Anat. In this sense, Anat is not putting on a 'brave face' or being deceitful, showing good humour on her visage but planning 'villainy' in her heart

¹⁹²CML2 (109) [*argm*] 'I will speak'. MLC (379) [*šl*]m 'y te [irá bien (?)]'.

¹⁹³Cf. hb. תַּשְׁמָנָה 'présomption' (TOu1 433), 'pride' (CML2 144), 'arrogance' (MLC 531).

(Dressler 1979 211 n.4), but is openly confrontational towards Aqhat (Walls 1992 187).

Anat then issues her warning to the young ‘hero’. The choice of the two nouns *pš’* || *gan* express perfectly the attitude of Aqhat witnessed in his preceding speech. The noun *pš’* does not occur elsewhere in Ugaritic although its Hebrew cognate is well attested, often with the sense of transgression against God (*BDB* 833). The noun *gan* is also unknown from other Ugaritic texts¹⁹⁴ but again its Hebrew cognate is well attested and often has the meaning of ‘pride’ in the negative sense. Thus Anat warns Aqhat that if she finds him conducting himself in this way, she will ‘fell’ (Š-stem of *ql*) him under her feet. However, this is not a warning, it is a statement of intent! Anat’s next move is to go to her father El to obtain permission to kill Aqhat.

3.4.3. Anat’s Request to El

3.4.3.1. *KTU* 1.17.vi.50 - 52

After a stereotyped description of Anat journeying to El’s abode, Anat falls before the supreme deity and makes her complaint concerning Aqhat’s behaviour.

50) [<i>l p’n. il. t}h*br. w tql.</i>	[At the feet of El she] bowed down and fell,
<i>tšth</i> 51) [<i>wy. w tkbd}n*h.</i>	she prostrated [herself and honoured] him.
<i>tlšn. aqht. ġzr*</i>	She denounced ¹⁹⁵ hero Aqhat,
52) [<i>kdd.dn}i*l. mt. rpi</i>	[the child of Danil] man of <i>Rpi</i> .

¹⁹⁴Whitaker (1972 160) suggests it for *KTU* 1.127.21, but the reading of *KTU* does not support this.

¹⁹⁵D-stem denominative verb of *lšn* ‘slander’ (*TOuI* 434 n.k, *CML2* 150, *MLC* 573).

[] 7) [] k. y ilm*
 [] 8) []
 al. tš[mh] 9) []
 a*hdhm. []
 10) [b] g*dlt. ar[kty]
 11) [qdq]d*k.
 ašhlk[. šbtk. dmm]
 12) s*b*[t. dq]n*k. mm'm.
 w[] 13) aqht. w ypltk.
 bn[] 14) w y'dr*k.
 b yd. blt. ['nt]
 15) w y'n*. ltpn. il d p[id]
 16) yd'tk*. bt. k anšt.
 w i[n. b ilht] 17) qlšk*.
 tb'. bt.
 hnp. lb[.
 ti] 18) hd. d it. b kbdk.
 tšt. b*/d*[] 19) irtk.
 dt. ydt. m'qbk

[Let not the sons of your mansion,] O El,
 [let not the daughters of your mansion rejoice],
 let not [the children of your palace rejoice].
 I shall surely seize them [with my hand (?)],
 [I shall smite them by] the strength of [my long arm].
 [I shall smite (?)] your [crown],
 I shall make [your grey hair] run [with blood],
 [the grey hair of your beard] with gore.
 And [call to]¹⁹⁸ Aqhat and let him save you,¹⁹⁹
 the son [of Dani] and let him deliver you,²⁰⁰
 from the hand of Maiden [Anat].
 And the Compassionate, god of mercy answered:
 I know you daughter, indeed you are incorrigible,²⁰¹
 indeed [among goddesses there is no] holding you back.
 Go, daughter,
 Villainous²⁰² is [your] heart.
 Seize what is in your 'heart',
 (what) you put [in the midst of]²⁰³ your breast.
 Your opponent²⁰⁴ will certainly be struck down.²⁰⁵

¹⁹⁷Compare lines 6-12 with text 1.3.v.19-25 (see above).

¹⁹⁸Restoring [qra.l] (CML2 110, Margalit 1981 99). For alternatives see MLC (381).

¹⁹⁹Cf. hb. פלש D-stem (MLC 611).

²⁰⁰Cf. hb. עור (MLC 599).

²⁰¹Margalit (1983 93f.) argues for *anšt* to mean 'manly'; he believes El is trying to subdue Anat's anger after the jibe of Aqhat about women not being hunters. However, since this is a response familiar to us from the Baal cycle also, perhaps we should not draw too many conclusions from it.

²⁰²CML (139) compares this with ar. *ḥanafa* glossed 'raged; was haughty' which is preferable to a comparison with hb. חנף 'be profane' (BDB) which is cognate with ar. *ḥanafa* (pointed out by Toul 435 n.e). MLC (552) relates it to EA akk. *ḥanāpu* which CAD (6.76) takes to be a West Semitic loan-word meaning 'to commit villainy', or as a substantive 'villainy' (CAD 6.81), which seems to capture the nuance for this passage: from El's point of view, Anat's intent is 'villainous', but totally within character.

²⁰³Restoring *b[qr̥b]*, cf. Dijkstra and de Moor (1975 194). Alternatively we may restore *d[it. b]* (Margalit 1989 200).

²⁰⁴Cf. hb. עקב D-stem (Toul 436 n.g, CML2 154, MLC 604).

Presumably there was a speech of El in the first few lines of the column since in line 6 we find the form *wt'n* 'and she answered'. The text that follows is a threat against El and his children that we can reconstruct from the parallel passage in the Baal cycle (see 1.3.v.19-25), but here we also find a threat that is specific to the narrative context of the Aqhat text: in lines 13-14 Anat taunts El to call on Aqhat to save him from her wrath, which may be an allusion to Aqhat's earlier taunt at Anat's ability as a warrior.

The response of El to these threats is contained in lines 16-19. In lines 16-17 we find the stereotypical answer that we also find in the Baal cycle parallel. Margalit (1983 93f., 1989 321f.) suggests that we take El's answer as an attempt to assuage Anat's anger by calling her 'manly' (*kanšt*). However, as we saw above for the Baal cycle, the translation 'incorrigible' is to be preferred, since it fits both contexts equally well being independent of any specific narrative context. However, we get to the real message of El's answer in lines 17f.

El characterises Anat's heart (*lb*) as 'villainous' (*hnp*). I prefer this translation (see the notes to the text) which relates it to the Akkadian root *hanāpu* used in an EA letter of Abdi-Heba (EA 288.8; *CAD* 6.76) describing the actions of his enemies against him, rather than the Hebrew חָנַף which is loaded with moralistic overtones which I do not see in El's reply. El's reply reveals that of all the goddesses, he knows Anat to be the least controllable - although she still obeys the wishes of her father. El gives his permission to carry out the *hnp* in her heart with seeming impunity for Aqhat's fate. It seems unlikely that El had no knowledge of what Anat planned for

²⁰⁵I take *dt ydt* as inf. abs. and passive of root *dt* cf. ar. *dayyata* (*TOu1* 436 n.f, *CML2* 145, *MLC* 539). Margalit (1983 96) cf. akk. *diašu*, *dūšu* 'thresh, trample, crush'.

him since his final words are an affirmation of Aqhat's fate at the hands of this violent goddess.²⁰⁶

There is little to commend Margalit's (1989 320) assessment of this scene as a portrayal of El as only the nominal head of the pantheon, as a caricature of authority. He writes,

For all practical purposes, the ancestral cult of 'loving-kindness' has been replaced by a cult of 'hate' and 'violence'. Anat is here the bratling daughter whose flagrant disrespect for her father is more broadly representative of the Raphaitic attitude towards the traditional ancestral values and mores epitomized by El and his 'old-fashioned' nomadic abode. Nowhere in *Aqht* is Raphaite society so clearly and so forcefully condemned for its brutality and irreverence as in this scene; and nowhere is the poet's identification of Anat with her Raphaite devotees so starkly unequivocal. The Raphaites love and adore the violent and bloodthirsty Anat, says the poet, precisely because they have become her mirror-image.

The assumption of El's weak position in the Ugaritic pantheon, and that he can be bullied by Anat into granting what she desires is at odds with the picture of El in the texts themselves (see my comments on text *KTU* 1.3.iv.53f.). If El is in such a weak position of power, why is he consistently approached by various deities for permission to act? If he has no power, why is the mere threat of his intervention between Baal and Mot enough to end a struggle that seemed so evenly matched (1.6.vi.26f.)? The texts indicate that El's position of power and authority was supreme and unchallenged, and in this case we have to understand El's reply in a different light than a submission under the onslaught of Anat's aggression (Walls 1992 192). His acquiescence to her request exemplifies his remoteness in terms of daily life from the activities of humans; his primary concern is with cosmic stability within the divine realm, seen in his actions of initiating a replacement for Baal, and his involvement with Baal's return to life.

²⁰⁶Contra Dressler (1979 211) who believes that El denies her request and "sends her home with a stern warning".

3.4.4. The Plot to Murder Aqhat and its Execution

Following El's permission for Anat to do with Aqhat as she wished, the text progresses over tablet 1.18 to the resolution of this tension in the death of Aqhat, as was only to be expected by the audience after Aqhat's behaviour towards the goddess.

3.4.4.1. KTU 1.18.i.22 - 32

Immediately after El's reply, Anat makes her way directly to Aqhat, after which we find the enigmatic encounter between these two in lines 23-34. The last two lines have only a few signs visible in each and their sense is entirely lost to us. As for lines 25-32, the text is damaged at the beginning and end of each line which seriously hinders our understanding of the text.

<i>w šḥq. btlṭ. ['nt]</i>	And Maiden [Anat] laughed,
23) <i>[tšū.] g*ḥ. w t*šḥ.</i>	[she lifted up] her voice and cried.
<i>šm'. m['. l a] 24) [qht. ḡ]z*r.</i>	Hear, I pray, [O hero Aqhat].
<i>at. aḥ. w an. a*[ḥtk]²⁰⁷</i>	Come, brother, and I ...
25) []. šb'. tirk. š*/l*[]	... sated ²⁰⁸ your kin ²⁰⁹ (?) ...

²⁰⁷The restoration *a[ḥtk]* is almost universal but is challenged by Dressler (1979). Dressler's personal collation of the tablet gives *at.aḥ.wan* as the only signs that can be read distinctly on this line. Margalit (1989 201) accepts the proposed restoration despite his comments that "the autograph ... is not especially favourable". He elaborates in footnote 17, "The head of a vertical (?) wedge evident in the autograph is also apparent". I have examined a colour slide of the tablet which clearly shows the *n* of *wan*. After this we find the top half of an obviously vertical wedge of a size which would indicate that it a word divider is possible, although another grapheme beginning with a vertical wedge cannot be ruled out. At the same height as the top of this vertical wedge and slightly to the right is the corner of another wedge; however, it is such a small fragment of an impression that it is impossible to know whether it was vertical or horizontal. The height of this small mark does not preclude it from being an *a* since we find in the same line that the *a*'s of *at* and *aḥ* are both written at a height equal to and above the top of the preceding word dividers. On the other hand, it could be the beginning of a number of different graphemes. I therefore concur with Dressler's (1979) cautious approach to the reading of this text.

²⁰⁸The form of this lexeme favours the view that it is the verb 'be sated' (*TOu1* 436 n.j, Margalit 1989 328) rather than the numeral 'seven' (Dijkstra and de Moor 1975 194, *CML2* 111, *MLC* 382) which should have the numerical form *šb't* if it relates to the following word.

- 26) []n*/a*by. a*/n*dt. ank*[] ... I myself have fluttered²¹⁰ (?) ...
 27) []l*(?)t*. lk. tlk. b šd*[] ... you will go on the hunt²¹¹ (?) ...
 28) []m*t. išryt[] ... man/death (?) išryt²¹² ...
 29) []r*. almdk. š*/l*²¹³[] ... I will teach you ...
 30) []qrt. ablm. a[blm] ... the city of Ablm, [Ablm]
 31) [qrt. zbl.] y*rh. d mgdl. š*[] [city of prince] Yarikh, whose tower ...
 32) []m*n. 'rh*m*[] ... their city (?) ...

Anat approaches Aqhat and laughs, and the audience is well aware of the ambivalent nature of *this* goddess' laugh. It may be the case that in Aqhat's eyes her laughter is innocent enough (Dressler 1979 211), but the omniscient audience has just witnessed Anat's discourse with El concerning Aqhat's fate. The crux for the interpretation of what follows lies in Anat's opening words to Aqhat. Very often the lacuna at the end of the line is restored a*[h]tk 'your sister', and the whole cola is translated something like 'you are my brother and I am your sister' which is taken to be a proposal of marriage on the part of Anat²¹⁴ (e.g. van Selms 1954 120, Dijkstra and de Moor 1975 194, Margalit 1989 202, Walls 1992 193 - with reservations).

²⁰⁹Cf. ar. *ta'ara* (Dijkstra and de Moor 1975 194, *CML2* 160, *MLC* 639). *TOu1* (436 n.j) offers 'passion' cf. ar. *tawra*^t 'ardour' *tā'ir* 'anger'.

²¹⁰I take this as 1s perfect from *nd* cf. hb. נָדַד as in Pr. 26.2 || נָדַדְתִּי. We know that Anat can fly ('p) like a bird; she flies to meet Baal from his palace in text 1.10.ii.10f. and indeed she will later attack Aqhat from within a group of birds (1.18.iv.21f.). Other suggestions include a cognate of the root *ndd* 'flee from' (*CML2* 152, *MLC* 588), perhaps emphasising Anat's swift approach to Aqhat from her father's house, or with hb. נָדַד akk. *nadû* 'reject' (*TOu1* 436 n.k). Margalit (1989 202, 325) suggests cf. akk. *nadītu* referring to women who 'marry' a god, as a parallel to his restored *klt* 'bride'.

²¹¹Margalit's (1989 202) suggestion of 'we will walk (through life) side-by-side' (restoring *bšd[y]*) can only be accepted if his hypothesis concerning the marriage proposal of Anat to Aqhat is accepted.

²¹²*CML2* (142) takes this as a place name. *MLC* (523) 'felicidad' cf. hb. נֶחֱם 'happiness'.

²¹³Often restored *š[d]* (*TOu1* 437, *MLC* 382).

²¹⁴I do not accept Gibson's (*CML2* 25) suggestion that Anat comes to Aqhat in the disguise of a 'mortal maiden'. There does not appear to be any scene in which Anat disguises herself between El's reply and her departure for Aqhat, and nothing else in the text would suggest

Margalit goes a step further in seeing the whole passage as a “pseudo-marriage proposal” by Anat to Aqhat followed by “post-coital relaxation” (324). In his view, Anat seduces Aqhat, “she approaches the lad and embraces him tightly, her body pressing against his”! She promises to be his *nadītu*, an Akkadian term denoting a woman who has devoted herself to a god, and his *klt* ‘bride’, although typically for Anat, she does not say she will follow after her husband in traditional fashion but that the two will walk through life side-by-side. Margalit goes on to explain that Aqhat is completely taken in by the goddess, and in an hiatus between lines 27 and 28, they engage in sexual intercourse. Margalit (326) comments, “the silence of the text at this point in the narrative is perhaps an indication of a libretto origin for the present recension of the story, the narrative silence corresponding to a scene of love-making hidden from the audience”. In the post-coital relaxation period, Anat then promises to teach Aqhat how to become a real hunter, now that she has made him a ‘real man’.

This is by far the most developed theory for a marriage proposal and sexual relationship between Aqhat and Anat, but the extent to which it relies on the reconstruction of lacunae, and the translation of obscure vocabulary specifically to fit in with this suggested context is alarming. The most bizarre highlight of his exegesis comes in the assumption that the climax (literally!) of this scene, namely the sexual intercourse between Anat and Aqhat, has been omitted from the text for reasons of delicacy! Apparently there is not even a lacuna into which Margalit can insert the appropriate phrase.

this. His suggestion that this is a ruse by Anat to obtain Aqhat’s bow by deceit is an attempt to account for the missing two columns and although a possibility, there is no way of confirming it. It is suggested by Margalit (1989 154, 205 n.28) that column i and iv are in fact contiguous and that the tablet had only one column on each face, since the narrative in column iv appears to be the direct continuation of column i.

As we can see from the translation provided above, the context is highly fragmented, and many of the words are not straightforward to translate. Even if we reject Margalit's interpretation of lines 25f., we still have to deal with the weight of interpretation of line 24b which sees in this colon a proposal of marriage couched in terms of kinship language. However, Dressler (1979) has recently looked at the history of this interpretation afresh, and after presenting a new reading of the text based on a personal collation of the tablet (which my examination of a colour slide of the tablet endorses), and reviewing the ancient Near Eastern evidence for the terms *ah* and *ah*_t used in declaration of marriage expressions, has concluded that this colon cannot be taken as a proposal of marriage, but is rather an invitation to Aqhat to attend to Anat. In this interpretation of the text, the initial *at* of the colon should be understood as an imperative from the root *atw* 'come' (Dressler 1979 216), and is an invitation of Anat for Aqhat to come with her to hunt near the city of Ablm.

I believe that Dressler's approach to the text makes more sense than Margalit's approach given the overall subject of contention between Anat and Aqhat in the narrative as a whole. The initial confrontation between Anat and Aqhat is the result of Anat's jealousy over the ultimate hunting weapon, the composite bow made by Kothar-and-Khasis. Aqhat provokes the goddess by casting doubt on her abilities as a huntress, and later Anat is to 'hunt' Aqhat. Here then we do not have a marriage theme, but one of hunting: Anat is inviting Aqhat to come and hunt with her, perhaps promising to teach him (*almdk*) some of the requisite skills. The idea of a marriage proposal is one that has been greatly influenced by the comparison with Ishtar on the Gilgamesh epic (e.g. Parker 1989, Walls 1992) but which has little to commend it from the text itself. The broken nature of the text does not allow wholesale restoration of the narrative, but what clues remain for us point to a hunting expedition; ironically it is Aqhat who turns out to be the 'prey' on this particular jaunt.

3.4.4.2. *KTU 1.18.iv.1 - 27*

The text which follows the break at the end of column i is on the reverse of the extant tablet and is labelled column iv on the assumption that this must be a four column tablet. This introduces a large lacuna between Anat's invitation to Aqhat to hunt with her, and the plot to murder the youth at the site where in column i we are told he is to meet Anat. What may have taken place in a gap of this size is anyone's guess, but it is apparent that at the resumption of the narrative, Aqhat is still in possession of his bow, and Anat is still scheming to obtain the bow for herself. In fact, there is the impression that not much has happened in the intervening two columns, which leads Margalit (1989 154, 205 n.28) to suggest that in fact, the tablet contained only one column of text on each face, with the result that only a small lacuna exists between the end of column i and the beginning of column iv (now perhaps column ii). This suggestion has the merit of removing the need to speculate about the content of two missing columns of text, and provides an answer to the view that the plot is not much further advanced than the end of column i. However, a comparison with the number of columns-per-face that we find in the Ilimilku tablets does suggest that a tablet of one column per face would be unusual; in the Aqhat narrative tablet 1.17 has three columns per face and 1.19 has two. A comparison with the Baal cycle and the Keret narrative suggests that two columns per face is low for these tablets, many have three and tablet 1.4 has four columns per face. If we were to accept this as a tablet with only one column each side, it would be unique among the Ilimilku corpus. On the other hand, even if we decide to follow the four-column theory for this tablet, it is futile to speculate what was lost in so large a lacuna, especially since the narrative gives no real clue to the missing plot. Therefore, however tempting it may be to interpret the following text as if it were a direct continuation of column i, it is perhaps wise not to rely too heavily on assumptions about the continuity of the narrative at this point.

1) []p*s*[]	
2) []. y _t br[]	
3) []. u _t m. d _r [qm]	
4) [bt]l*t. 'nt. l* kl*. []	[Maiden] Anat indeed finished off (?) ...
5) [tt]b*'. btl _t . 'nt[.]	Maiden Anat [departed]:
idk. l ttn. pnm]	[Indeed she set her face]
6) *m*. ytpn. mhr. s*[t.]	towards Yatpan, warrior of the [Lady]. ²¹⁵
tš _u . gh] 7) w tš _h .	[She lifted up her voice] and cried:
y _t b. y _t p. []	Pay attention Yatpan ...
] 8) qrt. ablm.	... the city Ablm,
ablm. [qrt. zbl. yr _h]	Ablm [city of prince Yarikh].
9) ik. al. y _h dt. yr _h .	How will Yarikh (not) be renewed (?)
b x[] 10) b qrn. ymn _h .	with ... in/with (?) his right horn, ²¹⁶ (?)
b anšt*[] 11) qdqdh.	with anšt ²¹⁷ ... his crown.
w y'n. ytpn. m*[hr. št]	And Yatpan, [warrior of the Lady], answered:
12) šm'. l btl _t . 'nt.	Hear, O Maiden Anat!
at. '[l. qšth] 13) tm _h š _h .	You [because of his bow] will smite him,
qš'th. hwt. l t _h *[wy]	(because of) his arrows, you will not [let him live].
14) n'mn. ġzr. št. trm.	The gracious one, the hero has set a meal,
w[] 15) ištir. b ddm.	and ... ²¹⁸ ištir ²¹⁹ with/in breasts/mountains/tents ²²⁰ (?)
w n'rs[]	and let us rejoice ²²¹ (?) ...

²¹⁵Cf. ar. *sittu* (UT 19.2500, CML2 159, ARTU 244 n.136), cf. eg. *s.t.* (van Selms 1954 60). *TOu1* (437 n.p) relates *št* to hb. שָׂטָן and translates 'le soldat buveur'. *MLC* (633) compares ar. *šatta* giving 'The destructive warrior'. Margalit (1983 96f.) gives a discussion of this word and argues for *št* to designate Yatpan as a 'Sutean warrior'.

²¹⁶Many commentators compare the akk. phrase *qarnu imittašū* referring to the crescent moon (e.g. CML2 112 n.2, Margalit 1981 101) but *TOu1* (438 n.s) wonders whether we should rather see *ymnh* as a parallel to *qdqdh*.

²¹⁷'Gentleness' cf. ar. *anisa* (CML2 141). Margalit (1981 101) cf. ar. *anisa* (IV) 'see, perceive', also found in 1.6.vi.20-21. 'Relentlessness' cf. hb. שָׁרִיף (*MLC* 516).

²¹⁸Dijkstra and de Moor (1975 195) restore [ġlmh] as the subject of the verb *ištir* 'stayed behind'. Margalit (1981 103, 1989 209) restores [brd] cf. 1.3.i.4-6 with *dd* 'teat, breast' and translates, 'Prepare a banquet and [serve] | *ištir* in a teat | and barley [in wine]'.

²¹⁹*TOu1* (438 n.v) proposes it to designate foodstuff in pots on the basis of *KTU* 4.290 and translates 'miel'; Margalit (1989 210) supposes a dry-measure foodstuff parallel to 'rs. Hoftijzer (1973) argues for this to be a verb and compares hb. niphal of *š'r* 'to stay behind' (Dijkstra and de Moor 1975 195).

²²⁰'Mountains' (Dijkstra and de Moor 1975 195, CML2 112), 'tents' (*TOu1* 438).

16) *w t**n. blt. 'nt.*
tb. ytp. w [] 17) lk.
aštk. km. nšr. b hb[šy]*
 18) *km. diy. b t'rt.*
aqht. [km. ytb] 19) l lhm.
w bn. dnul. l trm.*
 ['lh] 20) *nšrm. trhpn.*
ybsr. [hbl. d] 21) iym.
*bn. nšrm. arh*p. an*[k.*
 'l* 22) *aqht. 'dbk.*
*hlmn. tnm. qd*q*d*
 23) *tltid. 'l. udn.*
špk. km. šiy 24) dm.
km. šht. l brkh.

And Maiden Anat answered:
 Pay attention Yatpan and ... to you.
 I will put you like a hawk²²² in [my belt (?)],²²³
 like a falcon²²⁴ in my scabbard²²⁵
 [As] Aqhat [sits down] to eat,
 and the son of Danil to dine.
 [Over him] hawks²²⁶ will hover,
 [a band of] falcons will look down.²²⁷
 Among the hawks I myself will hover,
 [upon] Aqhat I will throw you.
 Strike him twice on the crown,
 three times on the ear.
 Spill, like a ravager²²⁸ (?), his blood,
 like a slayer,²²⁹ to his knees.

²²¹Cf. ar. 'rs 'make a short pause in the night', Mishnaic hb. 'érés 'to knead' (TOuI 438 n.x), ar. 'arisa 'grow tired' (CML2 155), ar. 'arasa 'rejoice' (MLC 605). Hoftijzer (1973) cannot give an obvious parsing of the verbs but takes them as 1s. Margalit (1989 210) compares Middle hb. מִן הַבָּרִי 'barley-groats' as a foodstuff in parallel with *ištir*.

²²²'Eagle' cf. akk. *našru* (CML2 153, MLC 593), 'bird of prey' (TOuI 438), 'falcon' (Margalit 1983 100 n.4).

²²³Cf. hb. שָׁבַע 'bind' and its use in 1.3.ii.13 where we find Anat using it to collect her war-trophies. 'Game-bag' (TOuI 438, Margalit 1989 340), 'wristlet, thong' (CML2 146), 'arm' or 'wristlet' cf. EA *ha-ab-ši* (Watson 1977a 71 and 72), 'belt' (MLC 545). Margalit (1983 100f.) rejects Watson's (1977a) etymologies but accepts the falconry imagery. He rejects Watson's assertion that Anat remained on the ground - she flies among the flocks. *hbš* is glossed 'pouch, bag', cf. ar. *hbs*; Yatpan has been turned into a bird of prey. Watson (1991) now rejects falconry after Reiter's (1990) article.

²²⁴Cf. hb. מִן הַבָּרִי 'Hawk' (CML2 144), 'vulture' (MLC 384).

²²⁵Cf. hb. מִן הַבָּרִי 'scabbard' (TOuI 438 n.z, MLC 637), rather than 'glove' as a falconry term (CML2 159, Watson 1977a 72) in the light of Reiter (1990) and Watson (1991).

²²⁶Reiter (1990 278).

²²⁷Cf. ar. *bašira* (TOuI 439 n.a, CML2 143, Watson 1977a 73, MLC 529).

²²⁸Cf. hb. מִן הַבָּרִי II, מִן הַבָּרִי 'devastation, ruin'. CML2 (112) leaves untranslated. 'Assassin' cf. ar. *sā'a / sa'ā* (TOuI 439 n.c, MLC 626). Margalit (1983 101, 1989 341f.) cf. hurr. *šiyē* 'water' following an observation of Loewenstamm. Watson (1991 360) is uncertain over this word but claims it may refer to a class of bird, cf. akk. *šā'u* (with metathesis). Compare the etymology proposed for *ytpn* by Watson (1976 373) who suggests 'Render, Ripper' cf. akk. *naṭāpu* 'to tear out' with metathesis.

tši. km 25) rḥ. npšh.

km. iṭl. brlth.

km 26) qtr. b aph.

u (b) ap. mprh (mhrh).

ank 27) l aḥwy.

Let his breath come out like the wind,

like spittle²³⁰ his last gasp.²³¹

Like smoke from his nose,

from the nose his vigour.²³²

I shall certainly not²³³ let him live.

The opening lines of column iv are greatly damaged and it is very uncertain what the narrative is describing. A comparison of line three with 1.5.i.5-6 may well be suggestive of a context of combat, or dismemberment, since we find in line two the form *ytbr* 'shatter' and in line four *l*kl**²³⁴ which may be a verb from the root *kly* used often in battle scenes (e.g. 1.3.iii). The word divider shown by *KTU* to follow this word may in fact be a final *y* since the edge of the tablet obscures the top

²²⁹Cf. hb. *שׂוֹחֵט* akk. *šahātu* 'killer' (*CML2* 112, *MLC* 628). Watson (1991) suggests 'attacker, one who pounces on' cf. akk. *šahātu*, and translates it 'falcon' (= lit. 'attacker, leaper'); he stresses (*contra* Watson 1977a) that *šiy* || *šḫ* are not falconry terms, 'but from observations of birds of prey in the wild'.

²³⁰Cf. hit. *iššali* (Dijkstra and de Moor 1975 196, *CML2* 142). Del Olmo Lete compares ar. 'atlu 'tamarisk' as a possible metonym for 'smoke' as a parallel to *qtr*. Margalit (1989 342f.) relates it to ar. 't 'be luxuriant, thick' and a morphemic *-l* denoting 'potentiality', which leads him to suggest 'a plant in bud but not yet in bloom'.

²³¹Cf. akk. *mêreltu* (Cutler and Macdonald 1973, *CML2* 143, *MLC* 530).

²³²The poetic division of this text does not require us to see the second *b!ap* as dittography (e.g. Dijkstra and de Moor 1975 196, Margalit 1989 212) or correction (Dietrich and Loretz 1978 68); unlike the previous *baph*, there is no pronominal suffix on the second, but one on the following substantive, and we are justified in accepting this as a parallel to the previous colon with a reversal of the word order. In fact the two bicola (as I see it) form the following structure: (Substance - Simile || Simile - Substance) : (Simile - Origin || Origin - Substance). I take *mhrh* as an abstract substantive 'strength, vigour' with pronominal suffix (*TOu1* 439 n.f, *CML2* 112 n.9) related to hb. *מהר* 'hasten' as a designation of the animation of the living as opposed to the dead (compare the English phrase 'the quick and the dead') and translated here by 'vigour'. Dietrich and Loretz (1978 68) accept the reading *mprh* and compare akk. *nupāru* II 'Herz, Gemüt'. *MLC* (581) accepts *mprh* from a root *pr(r)* (following Dressler) and translates 'postración, destrucción'. Margalit (1989 212) explains *mprh* from a root *pr* cf. ar. *farfara* 'flutter, shake' and takes this to refer to Aqhat's death throes; he also would restore *bšmt* rather than *uap* comparing ar. *šamata* 'be silent, lifeless'.

²³³I take the *-l* to be negative rather than asseverative.

²³⁴My examination of a colour slide of this tablet agrees with this reading.

of the wedge whose vertical lower half is visible, and in my opinion, the asterisk after the *l* is superfluous since the three vertical wedges that make up this grapheme are clearly visible. It is possible then to restore *l*kly*[t]* as we find in 1.3.iii.39 for example, with the suffixed *-t* a 3fs marker which makes sense of the preceding *[bt]lt 'nt*. However, we cannot rule out the possibility that *lkl* should be translated 'to all', although what significance this might have in the present context is difficult to imagine. The lexemes *uṭm* and *drq* are obscure and difficult to translate in such a broken context, unless we assume the context of 1.5.i.5; for various suggestions see de Moor (1979 642), Margalit (1980 94f.), and *MLC* (524 and 540).

Margalit (1989 334), with his usual eloquence, interprets these first few lines as a fight between Anat and some unknown victim. He writes,

Not improbably, the victim was an innocent and unsuspecting wayfarer whom Anat chanced to meet and with whom she decided to 'pick-a-fight'. For Anat ... kills for pleasure and relaxation. Full of disgust and self-loathing at having had to demean herself so with Aqht - the price even gods pay for hypocrisy! - Anat may have felt a need to 'let-off-steam' by clobbering someone, or something, to death.

Delightful as this description may be, there is little evidence to reconstruct such a scene from the fragments of text that remain, and Margalit's approach simply highlights the tendentious manner in which he interprets Anat's character and actions in this text.

After these enigmatic few lines we find Anat setting out for Yatpan in order to instruct him in his role in Aqhat's murder. From line 14 we find that the scene of the attack will be at Aqhat's dinner table. The imagery used in Anat's outline of her plan has led some to see in this narrative a description of hunting by the art of falconry at ancient Ugarit, most strikingly by Watson (1977a) and in more general terms by Gibson (*CML2*), Margalit (1989 335), Parker (1989 118), and Walls (1992 194 n.33) among others. The image of Yatpan as a *nšr* || *diy* (lines 17-18: often glossed as birds of prey such as 'falcon || hawk') fits in with the falconry imagery, and

this is reinforced by the translation of *hbš* by 'wristlet' parallel to *t'rt* 'glove'. Watson (1977a 71) went so far as to claim that Anat did not even hover among the birds over Aqhat's head, but remained firmly planted on the ground, sending Yatpan from her wrist to attack Aqhat. For line the parallel account in lines 31-33 he reads,

<i>bn nšrm trhp</i>	Among the eagles she made him hover
<i>'nt</i>	(did) Anat
<i>'l[. aqht] t'dbnh</i>	against Aqhat she loosed him.

This stichometry is analysed as a 'pivot pattern' (also Watson 1984 218 n.43) which is defined as "a couplet where the expected final word is not expressed as it is implied by the last word (or words) of the first line" (Watson 1984 214). The difficulty with this translation is that if *trhp* refers to Anat making Yatpan hover we would expect a Š-stem causative, while we appear to have a D-stem intransitive 'she hovered'.²³⁵ Compare the line in 1.19.32 where the *nšrm* hover (*tr*ḥ*p*n**) over the house of Danil; there the form is a D-stem and has no causative value. It is apparent that Anat herself hovers among the birds circling over Aqhat rather than standing on the ground and directing the operation as a falconer. Watson's (1977a) approach was rejected by scholars such as Pardee (1980 289), Margalit (1983 100), and more recently by Watson himself (1991) and Reiter (1990) who demonstrates the lack of evidence for the practice of falconry at Ugarit. She argues that the simile described in Anat's plan is of Yatpan hurled against Aqhat as if he were a bird of prey swooping in for the kill, rather than a trained hunting bird *per se*. This image is a powerful one within a narrative context whose tension is generated in the dispute over a hunting weapon.

²³⁵Cf. hb. רחף Piel 'hover'.

The meal with which we see Aqhat engaged²³⁶ appears to take place at Ablm, the location mentioned in Anat's speech to Aqhat in 1.18.i.30, and this leads some to take this to be his wedding meal (Dijkstra and de Moor 1975 195). A second proposal is that this is a meal to celebrate Aqhat's transition to adulthood (Watson 1977a 75). However, we saw above that there is little reason to understand that passage as a proposal of marriage; rather it is an invitation by Anat to teach Aqhat developed hunting skills.

I prefer to see in this meal the final stage of a hunt in which Aqhat has been engaged. After the kill(s) has been made, preparations are made for a lavish feast, and Aqhat enjoys the fruits of his endeavours. The significance of this, for the audience, is the two world-views of the characters involved in the narrative plot. For Aqhat, he is himself the victorious hunter who has killed and dismembered his quarry; for Anat (whom Aqhat has ridiculed as a huntress), Aqhat is her prey, and will soon be killed and dismembered as a direct parallel with Aqhat's own actions. This is perhaps the reason for the complex arrangements that Anat makes for Aqhat's death. Rather than simply slaying him on the spot for his insolence, Anat works out a form of death that teaches Aqhat who is the superior hunter; this brings a new interpretation to her words 'I will teach you' in 1.18.i.29.

Her final words in lines 26-27 form a fitting conclusion to her plan, *ank lahwy* 'I will not let him live!', and are the transition from planning to action, for in the following lines we find the repetition of her words as narrative action, quite familiar in Ugaritic narrative. There is no reason to take the *l-* in line 27 as an

²³⁶Margalit's (1989 155) translation rejects the notion that it is Aqhat who is setting a meal, and instead assumes that Yatpan has interrupted the speech of Anat to serve her a lavish meal, although Anat impatiently tells him to sit down and shut up! However, in lines 18-19 we are told that the moment of attack will be when Aqhat has sat down to eat (so also Margalit 1989 155). In light of this I reject Margalit's stichometrical division of the text in favour of that presented above.

asseverative particle indicating that Anat will in the end revive Aqhat once she has her hands on his bow (*TOu1* 439, *MLC* 385).

3.4.4.3. KTU 1.18.iv.36 - 1.19.i.19

From line 27 to 37 we find the narrative repeating the instructions that Anat gave to Yatpan, until Aqhat's life-force has left his body. We take up the narrative again at line 36.

36) <i>yṣat. km. rḥ. npš*</i> [<i>h</i> . <i>km. itl</i>] 37) <i>brlth</i> . <i>km. qtr. b*</i> [<i>aph</i>]] 38) ' <i>nt. b ṣmt. mhrh</i> . [] 39) <i>aqht. w tḅk. yl*/d*/u*</i> [] 40) <i>abn. ank</i> . <i>w 'l. q*</i> [<i>ṣtk</i> ' <i>l</i>] 41) <i>qṣ'tk. at. l ḥ*</i> [] 42) <i>w ḥlq. 'pmm*</i> []	[His] breath came out like wind, [like spittle] his last gasp. Like smoke from [his nose], ... Anat in the stillness ²³⁷ of his vigour, ... Aqhat and she wept (over) the child ²³⁸ I certainly understand ²³⁹ and because of [your bow] ... [because of] your arrows you do not [live] ... and the birds (?) ²⁴⁰ will do away with ²⁴¹ ...
--	--

²³⁷Although hb. 𐤏𐤍𐤔 can have the meaning of 'destruction' (*TOu1* 440, Dijkstra and de Moor 1975 196, *MLC* 614), I prefer to see its meaning closer to the Arabic *ṣamata* 'be silent' (*CML* 150 'silence, stillness') which forms a stark contrast with the noun it modifies.

²³⁸Reading *ylḏ* (Margalit 1989 213 plausibly restores *yl[d 'l umt]*), rather than *y-* 'woe' + *l-* 'to' + *k* 'you' (*CML2* 113).

²³⁹The form *abn* can be taken as a 1st person imperfect verb from *bny* 'build, restore' (*TOu1* 440 n.g. *CML2* 113 'create', *MLC* 386 'reconstituer'), or from *byn* 'understand' (Caquot 1985 94 tentatively), as the noun 'father' with pronominal suffix, or as a noun from the root *abn* 'stone'. Margalit (1981 105) cf. ar. '*bn* 'accuse, charge' (1983 102) inf. abs. 'Culpable am I' - an admission of guilt by Anat.

²⁴⁰I take '*pmm* as a plural substantive from '*p* 'fly' with adverbial suffix. Perhaps this is a reference to Aqhat's body being eaten by birds, in much the same way as Mot's body in 1.6.ii? I prefer to take Aqhat as the subject of the verb *ḥlq* rather than the birds (*MLC* 386). Margalit (1983 103) relates it to aram. '*ōpyēh* and translates 'it's leaves, foliage' which he sees as a comparison Anat makes between Aqhat's untimely death and the premature plucking of leaves or fruit.

²⁴¹Cf. akk. *ḥulluqu* (*CAD* 6.38f.) 'make disappear, make an end of, do away with'. Cf. the intransitive use of this verb in Anat's declaration of Baal's death in 1.6.i.42. It is decidedly uncertain whether '*pmm* should be taken as the subject of the verb or not. *whlq* could form the end of a clause lost in the preceding lacuna at the end of line 41 (perhaps the personal name Aqht) although the presence of the conjunction does not favour this interpretation.

As the column comes to an end, the text becomes fragmented and the sense confused. However, there are some interesting things going on within this section. In lines 25-26 we found the bicolon *km qtr baph* || *b!ap mh!rh*, but in lines 37-38 we find, instead of a narrated copy of Anat's instructions, the (reconstructed) bicolon *km qtr [baph]* || [] '*nt bšmt mhrh*. Rather than attempting to homologise these two variants à la Margalit (1989 212), I prefer to see a deliberate disruption on the part of the poet at the height of the dramatic tension: the effect is to enforce the fact that Anat is the one who is behind all of this, and she is there right at the kill watching Aqhat's life ebb away. Perhaps we should restore a verb with a meaning of 'saw, looked on'²⁴² (Margalit 1981 104) in the lacuna at the beginning of the line since a verb such as *šhq* 'laugh' or *šmh* 'rejoice' would seem incongruent with her weeping (*bky*) over Aqhat in line 39, unless we posit a new feminine subject for this verb apart from Anat, although I think this is quite unlikely.

Although the poor state of the text precludes a detailed comprehension of what the narrative is relating at this point, we find the verb *tbk* in line 39 which seems to tell us that Anat is weeping. We could postulate that in the lacuna at the end of line 38 mention was made of Aqhat's mother, or sister, as possible sources of weeping and mourning over Aqhat, but this seems a blatant attempt at avoiding the conclusion that although Anat has been the instigator of Aqhat's death, and there at the kill, she weeps over the dead hero. The most obvious parallel to Anat weeping over a dead body is found in 1.6.i.9 where she weeps over Baal before she carries him home to Saphon to be buried. However, there does not appear to be any kind of mourning ritual, or burial scene and we are at a loss as to how to interpret Anat's actions.

²⁴²Compare the verbs '*yn* and '*hdy* used to describe Anat's survey of the field of battle in 1.3.ii.23-24.

Margalit (1989 337) on the other hand can confidently inform us of what motivated Anat's behaviour,

Anat's remorseful weeping is a telling comment by the poet on the goddess' lack of foresight - she had apparently grown quite fond of the lad in spite of herself ... Despite her best efforts ... to conceal and deny her femininity, Anat is and remains, by nature, a 'weakling-woman' just as Aqht said she was.

I find none of this convincing. All through the section of the narrative which relates how Anat first spotted the bow up to Aqhat's death at the hands of Yatpan we are confronted with a sense of foreboding at the relentless approach of Aqhat's fate; as soon as Aqhat utters the insult to Anat's prowess as a warrior-hunter, and we hear her chilling reply, the narrative leaves the audience in no doubt as to the intentions of the goddess. There is no evidence to suggest that Anat is growing fond of Aqhat: she is out to hunt him, and she is a very skilful huntress indeed! Dijkstra's (1979 206f.) solution is to extract an earlier version of the tale from the Aqhat narrative, in which Anat had chosen Aqhat as her lover but that while he still lived in the plain "in their courting days", he was attacked by a nomadic warrior called Yatpan. When Anat discovers Aqhat's body she mourns for him; thus we have the reference to her weeping.

So what are we to make of her weeping for Aqhat? We cannot assume that this is the natural reaction after a hunt or battle since we do not find Anat weeping in 1.3.ii. It *is* her reaction on finding the body of her brother Baal, accompanied with ritual mourning rites and her burial of his body. The contention that Anat's words reflect her desire to revive the dead Aqhat (Gaster 1975 353, rejected by many scholars e.g. Caquot 1985 94) seems out of place with the general thrust of the narrative which presents her actions as a hunt whose ultimate goal is the slaying of Aqhat, not simply obtaining his bow. Perhaps we are to see her engaged in the preliminaries of a mourning ritual, but the irony is that she inverts the usual process by dismembering Aqhat's body, unlike her treatment of Baal's remains in 1.6.i.

3.4.4.4. *KTU 1.19.i.1 - 19*

The direct continuation of the narrative from the end of 1.18.iv to 1.19.i is generally assumed by the majority of scholars. Recently, however, Caquot (1985 95) has suggested that there may originally have been another tablet between these two based on his assessment of the narrative of each column. He does not see much evidence for a direct continuation. Cooper (1988 19) has recently stated that 1.19.i is preceded by a large lacuna and a dramatic change in scene “so it stands in complete isolation”. For his part, Parker (1989 99) has rejected Caquot’s suggestions on the grounds that a narrative continuity can be established between these two tablets. Obviously, the damage at the end of 1.18.iv and the beginning of 1.19.i coupled with the difficult vocabulary encountered in the latter column has led to this diversity of opinion. That there are grave difficulties in understanding this text cannot be doubted, but I believe that any difficulties are not insurmountable in establishing a continuity between the two tablets; in the one we hear of Aqhat’s murder, and at the beginning of the second we hear of the loss of his bow and Anat’s treatment of Aqhat’s body. There does not seem to be much place for a long episode intervening between these two parts of the narrative, and so I accept the general conclusion that 1.19 is a continuation of the narrative that comes to an end in 1.18.iv.

The first eight lines of 1.19.i are gravely damaged and we are only able to pick out a few words from each line (see the assessment of Caquot 1985). Unfortunately, lines 8-14 are also very obscure using obscure vocabulary, much of which is unknown from other Ugaritic texts; *TOuI* (407) judges it to be “le plus difficile de tout le poème”. With such difficulties as these, any translation presented is done so with a healthy dose of uncertainty, including the present one!

1) [l] *aqh*^t*

[Concerning] *Aqhat*

2) <i>tk*rb</i> . x[[x. l qrb*[?]m*(?)ym	<i>tkrb</i> ²⁴³ ... in the midst of the waters (?)
3) <i>ql</i> . '[]lb.	she/it fell ... (?)
<i>tt*b*r</i> 4) <i>qšt</i> []n*r.	shattered was the bow ...
<i>yt*b*r</i> 5) <i>tmn</i> . []	shattered was the precious ²⁴⁴ ...
<i>b*tl</i> . "n*t 6) <i>tlb</i> . x[]	Maiden Anat <i>tlb</i> ²⁴⁵ ...
[]s*a 7) <i>tlm</i> . k m*xxx. ²⁴⁶ y*dh.		[she picked up] ²⁴⁷ the quiver ²⁴⁸ like (?) ... [in(?)] her hand,
k šr* 8) k*n _r . ušb'h (ušb'th).		like a singer ²⁴⁹ (with) a lyre ²⁵⁰ (in) her fingers.
k* hrš. ²⁵¹ ab*n 9) ph.		And the stones of her mouth tore. ²⁵²

²⁴³This is a very difficult lexeme, and occurs only here. Many scholars simply leave it untranslated (*TOu1* 441, Cooper 1988 20). *CML2* (113) reads *wtrd* 'and came down'. Margalit (1984a 120) proposes a comparison with ar. *karaba* 'hasten, speed', which he proposes as a description of Anat's flight pattern which leads to her crash. According to him, Anat is so excited at obtaining the bow that she flies too fast and low and crashes into the water, thus breaking the precious bow. Margalit (1989 214) states that a personal collation of the text confirms the reading *tkrb*. His restoration of tlt 'nt in the lacuna on the basis that at the beginning of this text the name of the subject is required is not necessary from the similar situation of tablet 1.6 which has the heading *lb'l* in line one, but then continues with feminine verbs whose subject is Anat, mentioned by name in line 26 of column vi of the previous tablet!

²⁴⁴This may be a poetic parallel of the bow which was a gift of Kothar. Cf. ar. *tamīn* (Cooper 1988 20, Margalit 1989 216) which accounts for the masculine form of the verb *ytbr*. However, it could also be an adverb *tn* with suffixed -n meaning 'then' or 'there' (*TOu1* 441, Caquot 1985 97), or the numeral 'eight' (*CML* 113, *MLC* 387).

²⁴⁵'Sit' from *ybt* (*TOu1* 441, *CML2* 113), 'replied' from *tb* *MLC* (387). It is not entirely certain that the preceding *bilt* 'nt is governed by this verb or not.

²⁴⁶I cannot verify from a colour slide of the text Margalit's (1989 217) personal collation of the text. The surface of the tablet appears to be lost, and no traces of an *m* before the *y* are visible at all.

²⁴⁷Restored as [t]ša from *nša* (e.g. Cooper 1988 20, Margalit 1989 217).

²⁴⁸This could either be a verb (Caquot 1985 99 = 3fs of *hlm* 'to strike') or a noun. *TOu1* (441, Margalit 1984a 121) relates it to the *tlm* of 1.4.viii.4 which appears as a location on the journey of the messengers of Baal to Mot, and suggests this is how we understand the beginning of text 1.19.i. Dijkstra and de Moor (1975 197) suggest 'furrows' on the basis of 1.16.iii.11. *CML2* (113) leaves it untranslated. *MLC* (387) 'las armas' cf. akk. *tillu* (?) and hb. תִּלְלִי. Cooper (1988 21) compares the same Hebrew root and glosses 'quiver'.

²⁴⁹*TOu1* (441 n.f) cf. Mishnaic hb. *šūrah* 'line' and understands this to mean the strings of a lyre. *CML2* (113) leaves this untranslated. *MLC* (387) 'cantor', Cooper (1988 20) 'minstrel', from *šr* 'to sing'

²⁵⁰*CML2* (113) untranslated. *MLC* (387) 'arpa'. Cooper (1988 20) 'lyre'.

²⁵¹Margalit (1989 218) claims he reads *p* after the word divider and examination of a colour slide of the tablet suggests he is correct: only two horizontal wedges are visible. In this case we follow his suggestion of a conjunction.

<i>tiḥd. šnth. w akł.</i>	Her teeth seized (him) and she ate, ²⁵³
<i>b q*mm. 10) tšt.</i>	with gulps ²⁵⁴ she drank, ²⁵⁵
<i>ḥrṣ. klb. ilnm</i>	she tore ²⁵⁶ (like) the dog of the gods. ²⁵⁷
11) <i>w* tn. gprm.</i>	And she divided ²⁵⁸ his carcass, ²⁵⁹
<i>m*n. gprh.</i>	she cut up ²⁶⁰ his carcass,

²⁵²*TOu1* (441 n.h) cf. akk. *ḥarāṣu*. *CML2* (113) untranslated. *MLC* (549) 'morder' cf. ar. *ḥaraṣa*. Cooper (1988 21) inf. constr. with preposition cf. akk. *ḥarāṣu*. This could also be a substantive identifying a sharp instrument, cf. hb. *יָרִיחַ* in which case this is a simile for Anat's teeth or mouth, e.g. 'like iron blades were her teeth' (Caquot 1985 101), or "Wie ein Schneideinstrument sind die Steine seines Mundes" (Dietrich and Loretz 1979 196).

²⁵³I take this as an inf. abs. Dijkstra and de Moor (1975 198) take it as a substantive 'consumption, rotting' (*MLC* 387 'el alimento'). Cooper (1988 21) cf. hb. *כַּדְּמָא* 'knife'.

²⁵⁴Examination of a colour slide reveals that the scribe wrote over the end of the line at this point and into column ii. A *b* can be clearly read before the lacuna whilst the lacuna has enough space for about one grapheme, possibly two. At the right hand edge of the lacuna there appears to be the lower part of a vertical wedge, followed by two *m*'s and a small mark probably to separate the final *m* from the *y* of the next column, which has had to be written slightly further right of the column divider because of the intrusion. *TOu1* (441 n.i) suggests relating this to hb. *אֶדְיָ* 'adversary' as the object of the verb (Caquot 1985 100). Dijkstra and de Moor (1975 198) cf. hb. *קִמָּה* 'standing grain'. *MLC* (618) reads (*m*)'*mm*' 'entrails' as the object of the verb. Perhaps we are to relate it to ar. *baqqa* which refers to gurgling noises and which might refer to the noise Anat makes lapping up Aqhat's blood (see canine imagery in following colon). Cooper (1988 21) cf. ar. *qamma* 'devour', *qummatu/qumamatu* 'a lion's mouthful'.

²⁵⁵I take it as a parallel to the previous *akl* from *šty* 'drink'. Others relate it to *šyt* 'put, set' (*TOu1* 442 n.j, *MLC* 387). Caquot (1985 100) joins it with the *ḥrṣ* of the following line to give a *št*-stem verb.

²⁵⁶From the root *ḥrṣ* 'divide, cut' cf. hb. *חָרַץ* as an inf. abs. I follow Cooper (1988 21) who believes that this and the following *tn*, *mn*, *šr* are butchery terms.

²⁵⁷Margalit (1984a 122) 'chthonic gods' cf. *KTU* 1.20-22 (so Caquot 1985 100). Cooper (1988 22) divides *k-lb* 'like the heart/innards', and for *ilnm* he compares hb. *אֵילִן* and *אֵילִי* which he takes from *אֵיל* 'deer' and *אֵיל* 'ram' respectively, but the two forms with suffixed *-n* are both place-names (*DCH* 1.210, 212) which would help to explain this ug. form.

²⁵⁸Cooper (1988 21) cf. ar. *tanā(y)* II 'double, make into two', rather than the numeral 'two' (Dijkstra and de Moor 1975 197), or a verb *tny* 'respond' (Caquot 1985 102).

²⁵⁹*TOu1* (442 n.m) cf. akk. *guppuru* 'overpower'; the first is an infinitive followed by a perfect with pronominal suffix. Dijkstra and de Moor (1975 199) cf. akk. *gap/bru* 'strong, superior' hb. *גָּבַר* and *גִּבּוֹר*. *CML2* (113) untranslated. *MLC* (534) 'atacar' (?) [attack] cf. akk. *gapāru*. Margalit (1984a 122) cf. ar. *ḡafr*, *ḡufrat* 'cavity' nominal *qatal* formation, 'those who inhabit the pit'. Cooper (1988 21) cf. ar. *jufratu* 'chest cavity, middle of horses body', *jafir* 'carcass'; *gprm* is a dual.

<i>šr* 12) aqht.</i>	she pierced ²⁶¹ Aqhat.
<i>y'n. kmr. kmrm*</i>	He was humbled ²⁶² like one - like two poisonous snakes, ²⁶³
13) <i>k ap'. il. b g*drt.</i>	like a mighty viper ²⁶⁴ in the wall, ²⁶⁵
<i>klb* l 14) hth.</i>	(like) a dog at its stick. ²⁶⁶
<i>imhsh. kd.</i>	I smote him for this (reason),
<i>'l. q*sth. 15) imhsh.</i>	because of his bow I smote him,
<i>'l. q*th. hw*t 16) l. ahw.</i>	because of his arrows I did not let him live.
<i>ap. qsth. l* t*t*n 17) ly.</i>	Yet his bow was not given to me,
<i>w b*mt*(?)xh*mssr*(?)x(?)</i>	and by death ... ²⁶⁷
18) <i>pr'. qz. yh*</i>	The first-fruits of summer [became withered (?)] ²⁶⁸
<i>šblt* 19) b* glph</i>	the ears of corn in their husks.

²⁶⁰For a review of the problems in translating this lexeme see Margalit (1984a 123f.). Cooper (1988 21) cf. ar. *manḥa* 'cut, break, shorten'.

²⁶¹*TOuI* (442 n.n), *MLC* (387) 'el Principe'. Cooper (1988 22) cf. ar. *sarra* 'cut the umbilical cord, wound or pierce at the navel'.

²⁶²Cf. hb. 𐤀𐤍𐤁 ar. 'anā (*CML2* 154, *MLC* 602).

²⁶³For a detailed discussion of the phrase *kmr kmrm* see Caquot (1985 102f.). *TOuI* (442 n.o) leaves untranslated but gives various suggestions; taken as the title of an important person of the underworld with whom Aqhat talks. Dijkstra and de Moor (1975 198) take it as an emphatic *k-* 'how!' and *mr* 'bitter' as a cry of woe. *CML2* (114) cf. akk. *kamāru* 'overthrow', but not translated. *MLC* (566) possibly *k-mr*, 'un esforzado' (387). Margalit (1984a 125) cf. hb. 𐤀𐤍𐤁 'darkness' suggests a superlative construction 'darkest'. Cooper (1988 21, following a suggestion of del Olmo Lete) translates this as 'poisonous snake'.

²⁶⁴Cf. hb. 𐤀𐤍𐤁 ar. 'af'ā (*TOuI* 442 n.p, Dijkstra and de Moor 1975 199, *MLC* 517).

²⁶⁵Cf. hb. 𐤀𐤍𐤁 (*MLC* 532), '(sheep-)fold' (*CML2* 144, Cooper 1988 22), 'prison of the dog' (*TOuI* 442 n.q).

²⁶⁶Cf. akk. *haṭṭu* - used against a dog (*CAD* 6.155), (*CML2* 147, *MLC* 551). *TOuI* (442 n.r) imperative cf. akk. *hātulhiātu* 'watch'.

²⁶⁷Examination of a colour slide of the tablet reveals very little: after the *t* of *KTU* (which from its appearance might also be taken as a large word divider?) we find enough room for two graphemes before we encounter the right half of *h*. Dijkstra and de Moor (1975 199) read [*t*] *hms* 'turn sour', *CML2* reads [*y*] *hms* *š* [], cf. ar. *ḥamuḍa* 'was sour'. *MLC* (387) has 'el amamantado por Anatu (?)' [suckling of Anat] from *mss* following *CML*. *TOuI* (443) reads *mss* [*nt y*] *h* 'et le nourrisson [de Anat viv]ra'. Margalit (1984a 128) cf. hb. 𐤀𐤍𐤁 which gives ug. 'rise up'.

²⁶⁸Examining a colour slide of the tablet reveals that the *y* is clear and appears to be followed by a vertical wedge (bottom lost). The remaining traces favours a reading *yb*[l]* of e.g. *CML2* (114), *MLC* (387), etc. Cooper (1988 20) argues for the *KTU* reading and rejects *MLC*.

The interpretation of this final passage in which Anat acts is far from certain, and many diverse translations have been proposed. Some see these lines describing a journey to the underworld, either of Anat (*TOuI* 441f.) or of Aqhat (?) based on the observations that *tlm* in line 7 is also found in 1.4.viii.4 as a location on the way to Mot's abode. Alternatively this is a scene describing Anat's reaction to the death of Aqhat. Margalit (1989 344) divides the scene into three related events. First there is a description of how the bow was broken as the result of Anat flying too low and fast in her excitement, and overburdened by Aqhat's body. He finds evidence for this in the word *tkrb* which he relates to ar. *akraba* 'hasten, speed', and his subsequent analysis of Anat climbing the slopes of her mountain Inbab because she "no longer trusts her avionic skills" strains the text far beyond what the meagre remains can support. The second of Margalit's scenes portrays Anat's mortuary treatment of Aqhat's body. He believes that her actions fit accurately the scientific analysis of the treatment of the Neolithic plastered skulls from Jericho outlined in his 'Neolithic Hypothesis'. However, this claim for the survival of such a precise memory of an obscure mortuary ritual unknown for at least three millennia seems naive in its assumptions of the fixity of oral poetry and stretches one's credulity, and it is doubtful that even if (as he claims) some of these Neolithic skulls were unearthed by Bronze Age antiquities collectors, any ritual of incising gums and extracting teeth would have been extrapolated. His final scene is that of Aqhat's journey into the underworld where he comes face-to-face with its guardians in the form of a giant snake and a dog. While there are more textual remains for this part of the passage, I find myself in disagreement with his stichometrical analysis and philological discussion.

The phrase *ttbr qšt* in lines 3-4 may present us with an understandable phrase; Caquot (1985 96) suggests that the verb is active with Anat as its subject or, in other words, he believes that Anat breaks the bow out of frustration either at having to kill Aqhat to obtain it, or because she is unable to string the bow. Although

this is grammatically possible, it is difficult to imagine that after Anat had gone to all the trouble of obtaining the bow she would then deliberately destroy it. I prefer to take the verb as a passive narrating that the bow was broken, despite Anat's attempts to obtain it.

Far better, in my opinion, is the translation of Cooper (1988) who interprets this scene as the butchery of Aqhat's body as the finale of Anat's hunt. He explains (22f.) that Anat realises the bow is now lost to her, and she tenderly picks up the quiver like a minstrel takes up his lyre. Then she turns to Aqhat's body and butchers his carcass like a huntress with her quarry. Cooper (23) interprets her actions as a "dimly remembered" *sparagmos* since she believes that her actions will revive the vegetation; however, I find little in the narrative to support this opinion. His analysis of the difficult vocabulary in this passage draws upon Arabic, from which he obtains a vocabulary of butchery. I follow his choice for some of the more obscure words since this interpretation of the scene seems to capture the essence of the action at this point.

This scene narrates the resolution to the tension created between Aqhat and Anat in their first encounter in 1.17.vi. There, Aqhat doubted Anat's abilities as a huntress, but now we see Aqhat hunted stealthily by Anat as a hunter stalks his prey, then killed and butchered. The scene develops from one of tenderness towards the surviving quiver of the bow, held like a lyre in her hands, to one of exaggerated butchery. I understand lines 8b - 10 as a description of the ferocity she exhibits towards the body of Aqhat (Caquot 1985 100, Wyatt unpubl. transl.), ripping him open with her teeth, eating and drinking him like terrifying dog.²⁶⁹ Unlike Cooper (1988) who sees in *akl* a substantive meaning 'knife' and *tšt* from the root 'to put', I prefer to retain the parallelism of *akl* || *tšt* as 'eat || drink' and to see this as a

²⁶⁹See the comments of Dumézil (1970 139f.) on warriors being thought of in animal forms.

description of Anat devouring his carcass in the manner of a hunting dog, without the usual etiquette of cooking, and using eating utensils.²⁷⁰ In this respect, her actions are portrayed as deeply threatening, a fact seen in text 1.96 (see below) in which the evil eye's effects are described as eating flesh without a knife and drinking blood without a cup. This is acultural activity, and as such is threatening and sinister to the audience; Anat is behaving in the manner of an animal after the capture of its prey. In the second part of the scene she cuts up his body (presumably now in the role of victorious huntress) as the final humiliation of Aqhat's body, perhaps to prevent his proper burial (although this is accomplished by Keret, reversing the usual role of son burying father!), since from 1.18.iv.42 it would seem that her intention was to feed him to the birds, presumably those amongst whom she had been circling before she launched her attack. Again, we can see this as the expression of Aqhat's total annihilation, as we witness in 1.6.ii where we read in lines 35-36 that the birds ate the remains of Mot whom Anat had dismembered (*inter alia* Dijkstra 1979 200).

3.5. CONCLUSIONS

3.5.1. Anat in the Baal Cycle

We have seen that Anat's role in the Baal Cycle is limited to specific areas. It is not until her introduction in 1.3.ii, in the theme of Baal's palace, that she makes her startling entrance into the myth as a fully independent character. Her actions in 1.3.ii seem to be expressive of her character as a warrior goddess; she is

²⁷⁰I think this preferable to seeing the phrase *klb ilnm* as introducing a real canine into the narrative and having to choose between the dog as her enemy (as in 1.3.iii.45) or as an ally (Caquot 1985 100).

present in the battle field where she is the cause of great slaughter, but she is also the one who 'massacres' prisoners of war in her temple. The lacunae before and after this episode make it difficult to know exactly how her actions relate to the concerns of the narrative; however, rather than seeing in this episode an action whose purpose was to promote fertility, or cultic ritual drama, or the establishment of Baal's kingship, I prefer to see it as an introduction to her character. Whereas in the rest of this particular theme her role is dominated by a concern to achieve Baal's wishes, here we see her character in its purest form; she is a formidable warrior goddess.

Her belligerent nature is witnessed also in her reaction at the approach of Baal's messengers; she recites a list of vanquished foes and promises to make short work of whoever now rises against him. However, their mission is to invite her to Baal's palace, and convey Baal's wish that she perform a ritual symbolising the cessation of her warrior activities before she arrives. Perhaps this concern of Baal is an expression of the dangerous quality of Anat's character. As Dumézil (1970) has illustrated, the esteem in which a warrior is held is equalled only by the potential danger he represents to the community. Perhaps the same can be said for Anat: her warrior activities are beneficial to the gods when she slays the monstrous retinue of Yam (listed in 1.3.iii), but threatening when directed in on the very group she sets out to protect, the *bn il* 'sons of El'. Thus we see Athirat's reaction on seeing the approach of Anat and Baal as one of alarm for her offspring, probably as a result of the threats uttered against them by Anat in her address to El in 1.3.v.19f.

Anat's threats against her father and his family are not enough to persuade El to grant his permission, if we are to be guided by the remaining text. However, Anat's aggression in this context is not primary to her role as mediator between El and Baal. Her hostile attitude is simply a reflex of her character; we see her get down to the real business of her journey to El in lines 1.3.v.29f. where the tone of her speech becomes almost indistinguishable from that of Athirat later in the narrative.

However, her bid to win El's permission fails, and we read of Baal's and Anat's approach to Athirat, suitably laden with precious gifts. Although the text becomes lost in the fragmented state of the tablet, we found that it is Anat who appears to explain Baal's intentions, whilst Baal remains strangely silent. As I noted above, it is tempting to interpret this silence as another example of Anat acting as intermediary between Baal and El, only this time through the channel of Athirat. It seems that between the two male figures stand the two females who alone interact and achieve the desired results. This function of Anat as intermediary is witnessed again in the fact that she brings news of El's consent from Athirat to Baal; however, after this she is discretely dropped from the narrative.

Anat makes her re-entrance into the Baal Cycle in the theme of Baal and Mot. Despite my belief that Anat does engage in sexual intercourse with Baal (see next chapter), there is little evidence to support the conjecture that the heifer in 1.5.v.18f. should be understood as Anat in bovine form. The first assured mention of the goddess comes in 1.5.vi after a couple of messengers have come to El to inform him of Baal's death. Upon hearing the news, Anat goes in search of Baal's body and brings it back to Saphon to undergo a ritual burial ceremony. After a brief interlude, she appears again in text 1.6.ii in a scene whose pathos is hard to match in Ugaritic literature. Her unsuccessful plea to Mot (the ruler of the underworld) to give up her brother from the land of the dead is followed by her vengeful attack on him culminating in his complete destruction. Once again we are aware of just how powerful a warrior Anat can be, overcoming death itself.

How her treatment of Mot is to be connected with the return of Baal is uncertain, but in the very next column we find that his return is immanent. El gives instructions to his daughter Anat to relay a message to Shapshu to search the land for Baal, and we are to presume she was successful since in column v we find Baal returned to the throne of his kingdom. Anat's function in the theme of Baal and Mot

is more complex than that of the earlier theme. It seems that she is the one responsible for Baal's safe return to the land of the living through her aggression aimed at Mot. Anat also acts as intermediary between El and Shapshu in this theme although we find her attitude towards El much less hostile.

Taken as a whole, Anat's characterisation in the Baal Cycle is that of a warrior goddess. Although this aspect of her character is never forgotten and has an influence on the way she is portrayed in the narrative, we find that it is not as important in the theme of Baal's palace as it is in her conflict with Mot. It seems that more important than her general characterisation is her function as a mediator between El and Baal, both directly and through the person of Athirat.

3.5.2. Anat in the Aqhat Narrative

In contrast to her characterisation in the Baal Cycle as predominantly that of a warrior, in the Aqhat narrative it is her activities as a huntress that comes to the fore. Bowman's (1978 106) attitude to the Aqhat narrative is untenable. His conclusion for the Aqhat narrative is that since Anat is opposed to Baal in this text (i.e. Anat murders Aqhat), and since the Baal Cycle demonstrates that Anat's aggression is *always* used to support Baal's fertility (a view with which I cannot agree), then we should not take the Aqhat narrative too seriously in any attempt to understand the character of Anat. This is a good example of interpreting a text to fit a theory rather than more appropriately basing a theory on the text, and as such should not be followed. As we have seen above, a sensitive reading of the Aqhat narrative can reveal many aspects of Anat's character that are suppressed in the Baal Cycle because of her subjection to the narrative function she plays there.

In the Aqhat narrative we see her act in a manner true to her nature as a warrior and hunter, of which the latter is the overriding depiction of her character in

this text. In this respect, her behaviour in this narrative is similar to that which we witness in 1.3.ii. before she begins her role of mediator.

Our examination of the text has attempted to reveal the ironies involved in the text. Anat's character is revealed in the opening scene in which she sees the bow of Aqhat and drops her cup to the floor, overcome with jealousy for this ultimate of hunting weapons. Aqhat's rejection of her generous offers only serves to illustrate his own arrogance and stupidity, especially to an audience used to hearing of Anat's martial exploits. From this point on we see Anat engaged in a complex plot to wreak vengeance in the form of a hunt. Aqhat (rather absurdly) believes that his hunting prowess is superior to that of Anat. However, the audience is drawn up into the scheme of Anat, witnessing the discussion of her plans with Yatpan.

As Aqhat sits down to enjoy the results of his hunting expedition, Anat, who is stalking him from above, launches her attack upon Aqhat, throwing down her warrior Yatpan so that he swoops on the unsuspecting diner like a bird of prey upon its quarry. As Aqhat's life ebbs away, we see Anat looking upon him and weeping. But in an ironic reversal of the normal burial rites, she sets about him like a ferocious dog devouring its kill, dismembering Aqhat's body and scattering his remains for the birds to eat. In her treatment of Aqhat we find strong echoes of her dismemberment of Mot, whom she dispatched with equal ferocity. Thus we see that Anat's character in the Aqhat narrative is consistent with how she is depicted in the Baal Cycle. However, unlike the latter, in the Aqhat narrative she is uninhibited by any need to act as Baal's intermediary, and the development of her character is that much deeper because of it.

CHAPTER FOUR

OTHER MYTHICAL TEXTS

4.1. Introduction	258
4.2. Texts in which Anat plays a major role	259
4.2.1. <i>KTU</i> 1.10	259
4.2.2. <i>KTU</i> 1.11	268
4.2.3. <i>KTU</i> 1.13	273
4.2.4. <i>KTU</i> 1.96	288
4.3. Texts in which Anat Plays a Minor Role	300
4.3.1. <i>KTU</i> 1.22	300
4.3.2. <i>KTU</i> 1.82	304
4.3.3. <i>KTU</i> 1.100 and 1.107	307
4.3.4. <i>KTU</i> 1.101	309
4.3.5. <i>KTU</i> 1.108	312
4.3.6. <i>KTU</i> 1.114	315
4.4. Conclusions	318

4.1. INTRODUCTION

Although the Baal Cycle and Aqhat narrative provide us with much illuminating material on the character of Anat, these two are by no means all the mythic material at our disposal in which Anat plays her part. A further eleven texts are known in which we find her either as one of the major characters of the narrative, or more often simply as a fleeting mention.

In the following discussion I shall look first at those texts in which she is a leading character in the narrative; texts 1.10, 1.13, and 1.96. In this part of the discussion I shall also look at text 1.11, despite its poor state of preservation, since it is often viewed as a fragment of 1.10. Whether we accept this suggestion or believe instead that it formed part of a separate tablet, the content of text 1.11 is suggestive of a context similar to texts 1.10 and 1.13 and is thus placed in this first section. Text 1.96 also appears in this first section despite the fact that I conclude that this text is not really about Anat at all. However, since this text has been interpreted as a narrative in which Anat is the dominant character by virtually all scholars up until the work of del Olmo Lete, it is appropriate that I include a discussion of this text.

The second part of the discussion will examine those texts in which Anat plays only a minor role, or is simply mentioned in passing. However, this is not to say that we cannot learn anything about her character at Ugarit from references such as these. The texts examined in this section are 1.22, 1.82, 1.100, 1.101, 1.107, 1.108, and 1.114.

4.2. Texts in which Anat plays a major role

4.2.1. *KTU* 1.10

Tablet RS 3.362 + 5.181 is inscribed on the recto with a mythic text that describes over three columns a sexual liaison involving Baal. The tablet is broken and about twenty or so lines are missing from the beginning of each column, which hinders our interpretation of the text as a whole, although the fact that the scribe appears to have divided the text according to its prosody is an aid to translation. As we so often find in Ugaritic texts, it is what is missing that holds the key to a proper understanding of the narrative, and without it we are reduced to informed guesswork at the content of the myth. There is no scholarly consensus concerning the sexual partner of Baal; for Gordon (1977 117f.) this text is an example of bestiality¹ between Baal and a cow illustrating one of the baser characteristics of 'pagan' Semitic religion, and which is linked to rites of fertility (*TOuI* 275f., *MLC* 466f.). Kapelrud (1969 43) views it as a description of sexual intercourse between Baal and Anat, who both take on bovine form, although this relies on translating *arḥ* as 'bull' and 'cow'. De Moor (*ARTU* 114) argues that since Anat was unable to bear children herself (this is de Moor's interpretation of text *KTU* 1.13), she entered into the cow so that the cow could bear for her, and later writes (1990 71, repeated by Korpel 1990 254, 526) that

¹Gordon (1977) approaches this text from the viewpoint of modern ethical concerns based on the Hebrew scriptures which condemn such bestial practices. On the basis of Lev. 18.23-24 he accepts that bestiality had been a practice among the former inhabitants of Canaan, and that this text is a "reaction against the old pagan values". He goes on to state that "Bestiality not only added variety to sex, but it was glorified as *imitatio dei*", and that in contrast to the "austere purity of Yahwism", worship of Baal which included bestiality "had its charms for the populace"! The only evidence external to Ugarit that he presents for such a practice is the Cretan myth of the Minotaur. This view entirely fails to acknowledge the mythical nature of the Ugaritic and Cretan stories, nor does it explore the possibility that the Hebrew texts are propaganda against 'Canaanites' whose express purpose was to draw a distinction between the 'in' social group and 'outsiders' in terms of unacceptable and repulsive behaviour.

Anat suggests to Baal that he turn himself into an ox so that they can engage in intercourse. For Walls (1992 134) the question remains unresolved; although the text does not explicitly depict sexual intercourse between Baal and Anat, there remains the possibility that this is its intention.

Turning to the text itself we find that column I is badly damaged and difficult to interpret, although it appears to involve Anat and Baal. The second column takes up the narrative at the point where Anat is asking the whereabouts of Baal who is absent from his palace. After being told that Baal has taken his bow and gone in search of the wild bulls (*rumm*) on the shores of Shamak, Anat sets out to find him.

II.

10	<i>tšu knp. btl. 'n*[t]</i>	Maiden Anat lifted up (her) wings,
	<i>tšu. knp. w tr. b 'p</i>	she lifted up her wings and turned ² in flight,
	<i>tk. aḥ* šmk. mlat r*u*m*m*</i>	towards the shores of Shamak ³ full of wild bulls.
	<i>w yšu. 'nh. aliyn. b'l</i>	Aliyan Baal lifted up his eyes,

²A satisfactory translation of the lexeme *tr* has yet to be agreed. Usual etymological explanations are based on a root *tr*, cf. akk. *tāru* 'to turn', hb. תִּיר 'seek out, explore' (e.g. *TOuI* 283 n.m', *MLC* 469) or the root *trr* 'tremble', cf. akk. *tarāru*, ar. *tatartara* (e.g. *CML2* 159), and the form *tr* is explained as an infinitive. Walls (1992 133) suggests that this form is in fact a 3fs from a root *wry 'to go, advance' cf. akk. (*w*)arū 'to lead, bring (mostly of persons and animals)' (*CAD A/II.313*), based on his understanding of the sequence of verbs in lines ii.26-29 which, he believes results in a "chiastic verbal sequence". However, if we look for a moment at these lines, I believe that there is no compelling reason to reject the usual interpretation of *tr* as an infinitive. We find the following sequence:

- 3fs impf. - (noun + pronoun) - DN
- 3fs impf. - (noun + pronoun) - 3fs impf.
- 3fs impf. - noun
- inf. abs. - *b* - inf. cstr.
- inf. abs. - *b* - inf. cstr.
- inf. abs. - *b* - inf. cstr.

The inf. abs. can be used with ordinary verbal force (*UT* 9.29) and the inf. cstr. with prefixed preposition *b* has the force of a temporal clause (*UT* 9.26). Walls' suggestions of 'bring, lead' may work with lines 26-29 but here in line 11 he has to translate "proceeds (?) in flight". If we take *tr* to be an inf. abs. from a root meaning 'to turn' then we can translate these clauses in a similar fashion: in line 11, Anat 'turns about' whilst flying looking for Baal, in lines 26-29, the cow that Anat sees 'turns about' whilst walking, presumably due to the pains of childbirth, hence the final clause *tr bhl*.

³See *TOuI* (283 n.l) for a review of the suggestions for its location.

15	w yšū. 'nh. w y'n w y'n. btl't. 'nt n'mt. b*n. aht. b'l l pnnh. ydd. w yqm l p'nh. ykr'. w yql w yšū. gh. w yšh	he lifted up his eyes and saw, and saw the Maiden Anat, the most beautiful among the sisters of Baal. Before her he rose up ⁴ and stood, at her feet he bowed down and fell.
20	hwt. aht. w nark* qrn. dbatk. btl*t. 'nt qrn. dbatk. b'l. ymšh b'l. ymšh. hm. b 'p n't'n. b ar*š. iby	He lifted up his voice and cried, Life! sister, and longevity! ⁵ Your powerful horns, ⁶ O Maiden Anat, Your powerful horns Baal will anoint, Baal will anoint them from (against) weariness. ⁷
25	w b 'pr. qm. ahk w tšū. 'nh*. btl't. 'n*t w tšū. 'nh. w* t'n	Let us pierce into the ground my enemies, and into the dust the adversaries of your brother. And the Maiden Anat lifted up her eyes, she lifted up her eyes and saw,

⁴Cf. akk. *uzuzzu* 'stood up' (CML2 144) and hb. 𐤅𐤁𐤁 II. (BDB) which has the meaning of 'rising up'. Others take *ydd* from the root *ndd* 'to go, march, travel', cf. hb. 𐤅𐤁𐤁 I. (e.g. van Zijl 1972a 247, MLC 469) but I prefer the inherent parallelism of 'rising up + standing' || 'bowing down + falling'.

⁵Cf. *TOu1* (284 n.n) N-stem optative perfect from *ark* 'be long': "Que (les jours) se prolongent".

⁶The reference here to the horns (*qrn*: horns usually come in pairs in iconography) of Anat may be an indication that she could appear as a cow, and we have seen that Anat could be thought of in bovine terms in Egypt, e.g. pLeiden I.343+I.345 (Massart 1954 70f.). The fact that Anat has just flown to Baal's side only serves to illustrate the fluidity with which deities could be treated in terms of their imagery in myth. The present reference could simply be a reference to her headdress (*ARTU* 113) as we have seen in the Atef crown she wears in iconographic representations, and is a usual addition to the head-dresses of divine figures in ancient Near Eastern iconography. In this case, it would not indicate that Anat is in bovine form at this point in the narrative. However, it is striking that Anat's horns are mentioned here in the context of Baal having gone to hunt wild bulls, and Anat just about to see a cow birthing. Perhaps this is intended to bring to the mind of the audience the potential bovine character of this goddess, although compare text 1.101.6 where the daughters of Baal anoint his horns. The form *dbatk* is generally taken as a fem. noun 'strength' cf. hb. *dōbē* ar. *daba'a* (MLC 535) with 2fs pronominal suffix, although this is very uncertain (Watson 1977 277). Sanmartín (1980), *CARTU* (133) suggest 'head-dress'. Compare this to the very similar construction 𐤅𐤁𐤁 𐤅𐤁𐤁 'the horn of my salvation' in 2 Sam. 22.3 (= Ps. 18.3).

⁷Following the verb *mšh* and the preposition *b* we might expect a substance with which Baal anoints Anat's horns, e.g. *šmn* 'oil'. However, we find the difficult phrase *b'p*. Most translators give 'in flight' perhaps suggesting that Baal too has the power of flight (e.g. Pardee 1976 252). MLC (470) translates "con (poder de) vuelo" [with the power of flight] which is attractive, but raises the question of why Anat's horns need the power of flight when she has wings. Watson (1977 277) suggests "against weariness" cf. hb. 𐤁𐤏𐤅𐤁 'to be weary' understanding this to mean that Baal protects Anat from weakening in combat, in the light of the following bicolon.

	<i>w t'n. arḥ.</i>	she saw a cow,
	<i>w tr*. b lkt</i>	and it was turning about whilst walking, ⁸
	<i>t*r. b lkt.</i>	it was turning about whilst walking,
	<i>w tr. b ḥl</i>	and turning about whilst writhing, ⁹
30	<i>[b]n*mm. b ysmm.</i>	with the gracious ones, with the beautiful ones,
	<i>ḥ*b*(?)l*(?) k*t*(?)r*(?)t</i>	the band ¹⁰ of Kotharot.
	<i>[ql]. l b'l. 'n*t. ttnn</i>	Anat addressed herself to Baal:
	<i>[ḥ*/i*. b'lm. d i*p*h*]</i>	... O Baal of the mist ¹¹
	<i>[il.]ḥ*d. d 'nn. n[]</i>	[O god] Haddu of the clouds ...
	<i>[a*liyn. b'*[l]</i>	... Aliyan Baal
35	<i>[bt]l*t. 'n*[.]ph¹²</i>	... Maiden Anat ... her mouth

At this point the text becomes unreadable, with four damaged lines; we resume the narrative with column three.

⁸It is not altogether clear whether the following verbs refer to the actions of Anat on seeing the cow, or to the actions of the cow itself. *TOu1* (285) casts these lines in the future as part of a speech of Baal foretelling what will happen, later to be enacted in column iii. However, the introductory phrase *wṣu 'nh DN* is usually used to introduce present action (see earlier in ii.13 where Baal is the subject). *ARTU* (113) translates “she saw a cow and started to flow”, i.e. from sexual excitement. De Moor bases his interpretation on the akk. *alāku*. (*CAD A/I.305f.*) which can have the meaning ‘flow’ and be used of bodily secretions including blood, spittle, water, urine, semen, vaginal secretions, sweat, and milk. For example, we find the clause, *A.MEŠ ina libbi SAL.LA-ša magal DU-ku*, ‘much secretion flows out of her vagina’ (*CAD A/I.306*). However, *alāku* in this sense always has a liquid subject, not a person. De Moor’s translation, although attractive, should not be followed. Walls (1992 131) translates “she saw a cow and she led (?) in walking, she led in walking and led in dancing (?)”. This translation depends on taking the form *tr* as 3fs impf. of a root *wry*, cf. akk. (*w*)*arû* (see above fn. 2), and sees Anat as the subject of the verbs; Anat leads the cow to Baal. I prefer to see the cow as the subject of these verbs describing what Anat saw upon lifting her eyes, in much the same way as Baal sees the approach of Anat (ii.13f.), or Athirat sees the approach of Baal and Anat (1.4.ii.12f.).

⁹The verb *ḥl* has the meaning of ‘writhing in labour pains’ cf. hb. חָלַל I.; Anat is witnessing the behaviour of a cow in labour. Walls (1992 131) has “in dancing (?)” which is an acceptable translation of the Hebrew, but can only be this if Anat is the subject of the verb (unless we imagine the cow dancing). We find *ḥl* in 1.12.i.25 with the meaning of ‘suffer labour pains’.

¹⁰We have a choice here: *ḥbl* can either mean something like ‘troupe, band’, cf. hb. חֲבֵל (*TOu1* 285 n.s, *MLC* 470), or ‘pain, pang’, cf. hb. חָבַל (*ARTU* 113). The latter option, translated as “pangs of the Kotharot”, may be a meaningful parallel with the previous *ḥl*, but if we take the preceding *n'mm* and *ysmm* as references to the Kotharot themselves, then the former option, “band of the Kotharot” is preferable.

¹¹*CML2* (142) reading *ipu* ‘mist, clouds’ cf. akk. *upû*.

¹²An examination of a colour slide at this point shows a lacuna between the *n* and the *p* large enough for at least three average size signs.

...	...	About 20 lines missing
1	[]xm*(?) arht. tld*[] al*p*. l btl. 'nt w ypt. l ybmt. lim*[m] w y'ny. (?) ali*yn*[. b'l]	... the cows gave (?) birth ... ¹³ A bull ¹⁴ for Maiden Anat, and a cow ¹⁵ for ybmt limm. And Aliyan Baal answered:
5	lm. k* qnyn. 'l*[] k drd (drdr). d yknn*[] b'l. ysgd. mli*[] il pd (hd). mla*. uš*/l*[] ¹⁹	Indeed, like our creator [I will mount you] ¹⁶ like the generation ¹⁷ who begot us. Baal advanced with a full ['hand'], ¹⁸ the god Haddu filled [his 'finger']

¹³This line is very uncertain. *ARTU* (114) translates "[The wom]b of the cow can bear [for me]", presumably restoring *rh*m in the initial lacuna of line 1. However, there is no textual support for such a reading and it is based solely on de Moor's general interpretation of this text and text 1.13.

¹⁴Although the text is almost illegible at this point, examination of a colour slide of the tablet reveals that the restoration of *KTU* al*p* is more consistent with the remaining pattern of wedges than Walls' (1992 132) restoration a[rh].

¹⁵Cf. ar. *yafanatu*, (*TOuI* 286 n.t', *MLC* 561).

¹⁶Most interpreters restore 'lm, and translate something like, "our eternal creator" (e.g. *TOuI* 286, *MLC* 472, Walls 1992 132). *ARTU* (114) translates, "Surely I can mount [you] like our Creator", reading 'l[tk] from the root 'ly 'go up, ascend', but which can also indicate the 'mounting' of animals. Compare text 1.5.v.21 where we find t*š*/l'y parallel to š*k*b clearly in a context of sexual intercourse. Compare also akk. *elû* (*CAD* E.130) where the causative is glossed 'to cover (said of animals)', and hb. עָלָה (Paul 1982) as in Gen. 31.10, 12:

הַעֲדִים הָעֵלִים עַל־הַצֹּאן the he-goats were mounting the flock.

¹⁷For *drd*, which is clearly visible on the tablet, there are several possible solutions. We could take the first *d* as the relative pronoun and take *rd* from a root *rd(y)* 'rule, dominate', cf. hb. דָּרָה I., translating, "like (the one) who rules (us), (the one) who established us". In its favour, this translation could give the divine progression from creation to submission to establishment as ruler in one's own right. On the other hand, in the previous colon we find the preposition *k* prefixed directly to the verbal noun, whereas here we have a relative pronoun intervening, and no pronominal suffix (although its absence is not unusual for the second element in a bicolon). A second solution is to take the final *d* of *kdrd* as an error for *kdr* 'like the generation', or assume a final *r* has been dropped from a reduplicated form *kdrdr*.

¹⁸'Hand' (*yd*) is restored on the assumption that the final two graphemes of the parallel colon are read uš[b'h], 'his finger'. Given the parallelism in this bicolon, the most appropriate Akk. word to parallel ušb' is 'hand'. Here, 'hand' and the following 'finger' are taken as metaphors for 'penis', cf. *KTU* 1.23.33f.

¹⁹On the colour slide of this tablet, the initial *u* can be clearly made out, followed by two vertical wedges. Unfortunately, the second vertical wedge is found at the right hand edge of the extant tablet, and it is impossible to know whether this should be taken as a *š*, or whether another vertical wedge followed giving *l*.

	<i>bilt</i> . ²⁰ <i>p bilt</i> . 'n*[t]	The 'mouth' ²¹ of the Maiden Anat was spattered, ²²
10	<i>w p. n'mt. nht (ah)</i> . b*['l]	the 'mouth' of the most beautiful of Baal's sisters.
	<i>y'l. b'l. b ḡ[r]</i>	Baal went up onto the [mountain,
	<i>w bn. dgn. b š[]</i>	and the son of Dagan into the [heavens (?)
	<i>b'l. ytb. l ks[i. mlkh]</i>	Baal sat upon the [throne of his kingship,
	<i>b*n*. dgn. l kh[t. drkth]</i>	the son of Dagan upon the [seat of his dominion.
15	<i>l alp. ql. zx[]</i>	To/for the bull a voice ... ²³
	<i>l a*p* (a*lp*). ql. nd. []</i>	to/for the bull a cry was let out ²⁴ ...
	<i>tl*k. w tr. b*[]</i>	She was turning more and more with [labour pains ²⁵
	<i>b n'mm. b ys*[mm]</i>	with the gracious ones, with the beautiful ones ...
	<i>arh. arh. []</i>	The/A cow, the/a cow ...
20	<i>ibr. tld*[]</i>	A bull she bore ...

²⁰CTA reads *bilt*. *p bilt*. KTU remarks that the scribe made the *l* of *bilt* then over it impressed a horizontal wedge *t*. This is impossible to make out from the plates in CTA, but examination of a colour slide of this text reveals the faint trace of an impression over the first vertical wedge of the *l*, extending to just over the second vertical wedge. If we accepted that this mark is the grapheme *t*, although this is by far from certain, then its diminutive size in comparison with other examples in the text may be a result of its being placed over a *l*, since if it was average size then the *l* would have been obliterated. Although this might indicate that the originally written *bilt* was incorrect and that the missing *t* was impressed over the *l*, it is possible that the original *bilt* was correct, and that the scribe's correction was in error as he anticipated the following *p bilt* 'nt. In any case, Walls' (1992 132) reading *btl[t?]* is not correct.

²¹ARTU (114) translates, "The orifice of the Virgin Anatu was deflowered", taking the *p* as the noun normally meaning 'mouth' but which may have had a wider semantic range including 'orifice' = 'vagina'. Walls (1992 134) objects to de Moor's translation on the basis that he can find no attestations of Akkadian *pû* meaning 'vagina'. However, AHw (II.874) gives for akk. *pû(m)* a whole range of bodily openings, including 'Muttermund', which is the opening of the neck of the womb to the vagina, used from the Old Babylonian period onwards. Given this Akkadian evidence, it is possible that Ugaritic *p* also could convey a wider meaning than just 'mouth', and that its basic meaning was 'orifice, opening', allowing the possibility that in this text, alongside *yd* and *usb'* for 'penis', it could mean 'vagina'.

²²I read *bilt* (after CTA) as a 3fs perfect from a root *bl(l)* 'mix, mingle', cf. hb. בָּלַל, ar. *balla* 'moisten'. Akk. *balālu*, (CAD B.39f.) can have the meaning 'to be spattered with semen', referring to a man who has ejaculated in the night. We might either take this verb to indicate that Anat's vagina was 'mixed' with Baal's semen, or that her vagina became moist, either through sexual excitement, or because of Baal's semen.

²³TOu1 (287 n.x) suggests that the *z* may in fact be *p'* in which case we could restore *p'r* 'to proclaim', a good parallel with *ql nd* 'emit a speech, or cry' (cf. akk. *nadû rigma*) of the next line. MLC (473) has Anat crying out because of the bull calf, but it seems that the calf is not born until a few lines later.

²⁴Cf. akk. *nadû* (e.g. TOu1 287, CML2 152, MLC 588).

²⁵Translating *tlk* in a progressive sense, i.e. the cow (or Anat?) was coming nearer to the time of birth. Restoring *hl* after II.29 above? Cf. MLC (473), ARTU (115).

	<i>w rum. l[]</i>	and a wild bull for ...
	<i>thbq. a*[r]h []</i>	The cow embraced ²⁶ ...
	<i>thbq. a*r*h*[]</i>	the cow embraced ...
	<i>w tks*y*n*n. b t*n*xxx</i>	And she covered him with two ...
25	<i>y*~*l*. šrh. w šhph</i>	... ²⁷ his umbilical cord ²⁸ and his milk, ²⁹
	<i>x b* šhp. šgrth</i>	... with the milk of his youth.
	<i>yrk. t'l. b (Rasur: tk) gr</i>	By the flank ³⁰ she went up onto the mountain,
	<i>mslmt. b gr. tlyt</i>	by the raised ways ³¹ onto Mount of Victory.
	<i>w t'l. bkm. b arr*</i>	And she went up onto the hill, ³² onto Arar, ³³
30	<i>bm. arr. w b š*p*n*</i>	onto Arar, and onto Saphon,
	<i>b n'm. b gr. tl*i*yt</i>	onto the pleasant place, onto Mount of Victory.
	<i>ql. l b'l. ttnn*</i>	She announced to Baal:
	<i>bšrt. il. b*š*[r. b]*~l</i>	Receive divinely good news, Baal, ³⁴

²⁶Or, 'she embraced the cow'; cf. *MLC* (473).

²⁷The verification of *KTU*'s reading is extremely difficult from the colour slide I have examined. The head of a *y* appears at the beginning of the line, but the following grapheme is almost obliterated, appearing only as the top corner of a wedge. Just before the following *š*, which is clearly depicted, there are some traces which may be the bottom of at least two vertical wedges, but the damage to the surface at this point makes it impossible to be certain. *TOuI* (288 n.a) restores *y[nq]* 'to suck' (cf. *ARTU* 115). *MLC* follows *KTU* "sobre" [over].

²⁸Many interpreters compare hb. *רֶשֶׁת* 'umbilical cord'. Might this be a reference to the practice of preserving the placenta and umbilical cord (Wyatt 1987b 402)?

²⁹Cf. Syriac *šēhāpā* 'colostrum, milk' (*TOuI* 288 n.b, *CML2* 158, *ARTU* 115). *MLC* (473) translates "su tierna piel (?)" [his tender skin], on the basis of ar. *saḥafa*, *saḥifu* 'woven material, new or weak skin'.

³⁰This is probably a geographical term to describe a mountainous feature. Cf. hb. (ר)רר which can refer to side or flank of mountain (*TOuI* 288 n.d, *MLC* 562, *ARTU* 115).

³¹*TOuI* (288) translates *mslmt* as a verb, but it is better to see it as parallel to *yrk* and allow the verb *t'l* to be understood in this second colon. As a noun parallel to *yrk*, cf. hb. *מָלַח* and *מִלְחָמָה* which indicate some kind of path or highway. The first is particularly interesting as it comes in Gen. 28.12 where Jacob dreams of a *מִלְחָמָה* 'ladder' stretching from earth up to heaven upon which divine beings were travelling (*UT* 19.1761). Clifford's (1972 75 n.50) rejection of this meaning for *mslmt* is based on faulty stichometry and is not accepted. Here we have an Ugaritic parallel; in this case, Anat travels along the *mslmt* up to heaven (cf. line 12 if we restore *šmm*), and even more interestingly, a specific route appears to follow, beginning with the 'hill' (*km*), then onto Arar (*arr*) and finally up to Saphon itself.

³²*TOuI* (288 n.f) cf. ar. *kīm* 'hill' (following Aistleitner).

³³*TOuI* (288 n.g) a toponym known from administrative documents, (*PRU* II.173.2, V.35.1, 42.1, 76.32).

	<i>w* bšr. ḥ*tk. d*g*n*</i>	receive good news, scion of Dagan. ³⁵
35	<i>k*. ibr. l b'l[.] y*l*(?)d*</i>	For a bull-calf has been born to Baal,
	<i>w* r*um. l rk*b*[.] *r*p*t*</i>	a wild bull to the rider of the clouds. ³⁶
	<i>yšm*ḥ. al*iy*n. b**l</i>	Aliyan Baal rejoiced.

In the second column we find Anat searching for Baal. She goes to his palace and is told that he has gone out to hunt the wild bulls at the shores of Shamak. She flies to meet him, and on seeing her approach Baal stands up to meet her and falls at her feet in adoration. Anat sees a cow, presumably part of the herd Baal was hunting, in the pains of labour, then returns her attention to Baal and addresses a speech to him which unfortunately is too damaged for us to comprehend.

Column three begins with what is probably a speech by Anat addressed to Baal, since we find in line 4 the phrase "And Aliyan Baal answered" which can only be addressed to Anat. The speech of Baal that follows is crucial to our interpretation of this text. In our translation of the speech, Baal gives a description of his copulation with Anat, and we are to assume that these actions were carried out, for directly after this, Baal goes to his house and awaits the news of the birth.

There then follows a description of the labour, birth, and post-natal care of the offspring. From our translation it appears that the cow (*arḥ*) is the subject of the verbs describing the labour and birth; nowhere is the divine name Anat mentioned, and the question remains whether Anat and the cow are one and the same, or whether

³⁴The following two lines could be translated, "Good news O God, receive good news Baal, receive good news scion of Dagan". However, the fact that we have here a bicolon points away from such a translation. The phrase *bšrt il* is to be taken as a noun and *il* as the superlative, hence ARTU's (115) "Receive divinely good news, Ba'lu".

³⁵Taking *ḥtk* as cognate with ar. *ḥataka* akk. *etēku* meaning 'care for' (Healey 1980 408). For an alternative explanation of the phrase *ḥtk dgn* as 'Lord of the Rain' cf. hb. חָלַק 'divide, determine' see Wyatt (1980 and 1992).

³⁶For this title of Baal see Wyatt (1992 415f.).

they are to be distinguished. We have already seen that Baal anoints the horns of Anat, a possible allusion to the bovine form of this goddess, and the copulation appears to take place between Baal and Anat, if my translation is correct. A further pointer to the identity of Anat and the cow occurs in the change of scene between the care of the new-born and the journey of the messenger to Baal's house to give him the glad tidings. At this juncture there is no apparent change of subject (Bowman 1978 102); the verbs continue as 3fs imperfect. If there were a change of subject, for example from the cow to Anat, then we would expect the divine name to occur in line 27 to indicate such a change. This lack of change in subject suggests that the female who is the subject of the verbs *tld* (line 20), *thbq* (lines 22-23), and *tksynn* (line 24), is the same person as the subject of the verbs *t'l* (lines 27, 29), and *ttnn* (line 32). The underlying bovine imagery of this whole narrative points to the cow as the subject of these verbs, but the copulation scene between Baal and Anat, and the fact that a cow is the later subject of the birth scene, equates Anat with the cow. A further comparison can be made between the scene describing the news of the birth and *KTU* 1.4.v.25f. We find similar vocabulary such as *tbšr b'l* 'receive good news Baal' (line 26), and *šmh aliyn b'l* 'Aliyan Baal rejoiced' (line 35f.), and the fact that Anat is the bearer of good news in 1.4.v, adds weight to our argument that Anat brings glad tidings to Baal in this text, which means she is the cow who has just given birth. Walls (1992 134) objects to such an identification, noting,

If, however, Anat is identified with the cow in this episode then she is certainly a hardy mother, rushing off to tell the father herself immediately after bearing and suckling the child.

However, such an observation completely misses the point that in this text we are dealing with myth and therefore the characters, especially divine characters, are not always constrained by the physical and temporal realities of real life. If we seriously adopted Walls' attitude to mythic characterisation, we would certainly have some hard questions to answer about the 'hardiness' of Mot, for example, who after

being utterly destroyed by Anat in 1.6.i, is again threatening to overpower Baal in 1.6.vi!

4.2.2. KTU 1.11

Text 1.11 (RS 3.319), like RS 3.362, was found in the house of the High Priest (*TEOI*) and appears to be the top right hand corner of a larger tablet. I include it here, despite its highly fragmentary state, because many scholars see in this fragment either the text from the beginning of column iii of text 1.10 (*TOuI* 275, *MLC* 471, Day 1992 184) based on the similarities seen between these texts (similar handwriting, division into poetic cola, written only on the recto (*CTA* 51-52), or at least that the text has strong links with the narrative in text 1.10 (*CML2* 32, Walls 1992 135). Only the first eight lines give enough script to enable us to propose translational values to the words, but hardly any sense can be obtained for the text as a whole.

1	[l*(?). ytkh. w yihd. b qrb*]	[Baal (?)] was aroused ³⁷ and grasped ³⁸ her womb ³⁹
	[l*tkh*. w tihd. b ušk*]	[Anat (?)] was aroused and grasped his penis ⁴⁰
	[b]*l*. ya*bd. ⁴¹ l alp	... Baal yabd ⁴² for/to the bull (?)

³⁷The etymology and meaning of this verb is very uncertain (Walls 1992 135f.), and we cannot be sure that Baal is the subject of this verb and Anat the subject of the following colon. The verbs in this colon have a prefixed *y* and the subject is probably masculine, contrasting with the feminine verbs of the parallel colon, so we are dealing with a male || female pair. We find Anat and Baal in lines 7-8, and probably again in lines 4-5, and if *KTU*'s reading of a *l* after the lacuna beginning line 1 is correct, I think there is a high likelihood that we are dealing with Baal in line 1 and Anat in line 2. There is very little agreement on the verb *tkh*. *TOu1* (239 n.f) is guided by the context of *KTU* 1.5.i.4 (||30), 1.10.1, 2, and 1.24.4, "s'enflamment", and hb. נִכְחַח in Is. 23.16 where it qualifies a prostitute and may mean 'on heat'. However, its contrast with נִשְׁכַּח 'you will be remembered' suggests that the common meaning of נִכַּח 'forget' is more appropriate. *MLC* (471) suggests 'apretar' [grasp] cf. ar. *kataḥa* 'gather'. Walls (1992 135), who gives a good account of the alternative solutions, suggests 'droop (?)' following the work of Albright and Patton who see in hb. נִכַּח a meaning 'to waste away, wither, dry up'. Although a satisfactory etymology alludes us, I think we can be guided by the context of *KTU* 1.24.4f. which is read *ytkh yh[bq.]d tld* 'he *tkh* and embraced (?) the one who would give birth'. Here, *tkh* denotes an action (intransitive?) that precedes sexual union, which probably takes place at this point in 1.24 given the following reference to the Kotharot and their proclamation in line 7 *hl ḡlmt tld bn* 'behold the maiden will bear a son'. Using 1.24 as our basis (despite Walls' contention that the plot of 1.24 at this early point is too unclear for any useful comparison), we can assume that *tkh* in 1.11.1-2 is an action that precedes sexual intercourse, perhaps 'be aroused'.

³⁸This common Semitic lexeme is usually taken to mean "grasp, seize, hold", cf. hb. נָחַץ (*DCH* 1.186), but in akk. *aḥāzu* (*CAD* A/I.173f.) it can also have the meaning of 'to take a wife, marry' and even be used to describe sexual intercourse (175). Walls (1992 137) notes the "ridiculous image" of 'grasping the womb', but perhaps this image has been influenced by the more meaningful phrase 'grasp the penis' as found in akk. (Watson 1977 277), and the fact that a recognised metaphor for penis is 'hand', which of course may lead to the image of the hand 'grasping'. For the verb *aḥd* with the preposition *b* marking the direct object see Pardee (1977 206).

³⁹*TOu1* (289 n.k) translate *qrb* as "vulve", stating that it has the same meaning in Gen. 25.22. However, hb. קֶרֶב in this text is more likely to mean 'womb', for anatomical reasons, and because in the following verse, the noun בֶּטֶן 'belly, womb' is used, and there is no further evidence for *qrb* in Ugaritic to mean 'vulva'. *MLC* (471) "vulva". Cf. akk. *qerbītu* 'womb' (*CAD* Q.214). As I suggested in the previous note, if a penis can be designated by *yd* 'hand' then perhaps the image of grasping (an action of the 'hand') the womb is a metaphor for sexual intercourse? However, I do not want to press this point since there is little evidence to support this theory. The *b* prefixed to *qrb* and *uṣ[r/k]* is problematical.

⁴⁰*TOu1* (289 n.l) refers to line 22 of text RS 24.272 (*KTU* 1.124) in which is restored *uṣr* 'penis', cf. akk. *iṣaru*, *uṣāru* (*CAD* I-J.226). This is followed by Watson (1977 277) who provides a Mesopotamian sexual omen in similar vein, and *MLC* (471) who translates "pene". Walls (1992 137) suggests that both 'penis' or 'testicle' are plausible parallels to 'womb', but I prefer 'penis' after Watson's comparison.

	[b]t*lt. 'nt	... Maiden Anat
5	[]q. hry. w yl*d	... conceived and gave birth ⁴³
	[]xm. hbl. ktr*t*	... band of the Kotharot
	[bt]l*t. 'nt	... Maiden Anat
	[ali]yn. b'l	... Aliyan Baal

Text 1.11 has been presented confidently by numerous scholars as a vivid and realistic portrayal of sexual intercourse between Baal and Anat (e.g. van Selms 1954 47, *TOu1* 275, *CML2*, *MLC*, *ARTU*, Korpel 1990 123). However, our translation of the text illustrates that such a straightforward interpretation of these lines is not at once forthcoming. There are considerable difficulties of interpretation, so much so that latest attempts have negated this earlier interpretation (Day 1992 184, Walls 1992 138).

In this text we find the divine names Anat and Baal, but not in a context that clearly illustrates that they are engaged in sexual activity. In line 4 we find a

⁴¹Examination of a colour slide at this point reveals what appears to be the left hand edge of a horizontal wedge after the y but the impressions are so faint at this point, unlike the preceding y and following bd that the intended grapheme can only be guessed at.

⁴²*TOu1* (289 n.m) reads *yabd* and translates "Baal est pris de passion pour les bœufs", cf. ar. *abida* 'to be furious', eth. 'e^bed 'mad'. *MLC* (471) 'Balu se sintió frustrado' [Baal felt frustrated]. Walls (1992 137f.) gives a detailed discussion of the interpretation of this verb by various scholars. A particular problem is its relationship to the following *lalp*. If we accept that this tablet is the missing right hand column from text 1.10 then we have to take the ends of the lines as the correct division into poetic cola, as we find in 1.10. In this case the *lalp* would be the dative object of the verb *a/nbd* and Baal is most likely to be the subject in parallel to Anat in the following colon, which means any sexual connotation for this verb would be directed to the *alp* which in Ugaritic is a male animal (Walls 1992 138). On the other hand, apart from the first two lines, there is no other evidence to suggest that these lines are divided by poetic cola. The following line ends so far back from the edge of the tablet that we could argue for *lalp* belonging with this divine name, and for a verb appearing at the beginning of this following line: in other words, Anat does something to the bull. The difficulties of this text are so great that it is perhaps best to leave this verb untranslated and admit that this text is too fragmentary to make sense of at this point.

⁴³If the subject of these verbs is feminine (such as Anat) then *hry* and *yld* must be infinitives.

reference to *btlt* 'nt, which suggests the]*l* of the previous line can be read as the divine name Baal as a suitable parallel (Walls 1992 184). The names Anat and Baal occur also in lines 7-8, but again, there is no context in which to place them. The restoration of Baal in line one and Anat in line two (e.g. Lipinski 1965 63) is admittedly conjectural and rejected by Walls (1992) and Day (1991 and 1992), and it is entirely possible that some other masculine and feminine subjects were involved which have been lost in the lacunae. However, if *KTU*'s reading of a possible *l* after the lacuna at the beginning of line 1 is correct then the restoration of the divine name Baal is a possibility and is consistent with the masculine subject of the verbs of this line. The restoration of Anat as a suitable parallel has no textual confirmation in line 2, and can only be inferred from her apparent paralleling with Baal in lines 4-5 and 7-8 and the fact that the verbs in line 2 are governed by a feminine subject; but if, as Walls and Day believe, Anat cannot be the female with whom Baal has sexual intercourse, then we should look for another subject, such as a cow (*arh*) as they believe to be the case for 1.10, or perhaps a heifer ('*glt* || *prt*) as we find in 1.5.v.

Leaving to one side for the moment the question of the identity of the subjects in lines 1-2, we are still faced with a difficult task in understanding this fragment. The extant text begins with a male becoming aroused and grasping a womb, paralleled by a female becoming aroused and grasping a penis (?), and the later presence of the infinitives *hry* (conceive) and *yld* (give birth), along with the *hbl ktrt* (band of Kotharot), all of which point to the sexual basis of this narrative. The verb *tkh* is very difficult to interpret but I believe that a comparison with 1.24.4f. allows us to see in this an action or state that precedes sexual intercourse (van Selms 1975 480). 'Grasping the womb' may or may not make much sense, depending on what constraints we place on poetry to conform to physical realities. There are strong lexical and syntactical parallels between lines 1 and 2, and since we can make sense of 'grasping the penis' in line 2 as an inherently sexual action (especially in light of the

akk. parallel presented by Watson 1977) then I think we have strong grounds in assuming a sexual act in the preceding line. As I pointed out in my notes to the text, perhaps the notion of a penis 'grasping' a womb is in some way influenced by the fact that a common metaphor for penis was 'hand' (*yd*), for which of course 'grasping' is a natural action.

As for the identity of the two characters involved, I agree with Walls' (1992 138f.) observation that strictly on the basis of the extant text it would be speculative to assert their identity as Baal and Anat, since their names do not occur in lines 1-2, which are the most sexually explicit lines of this fragment. I also agree with him that it would be unjustified to assert that Baal and Anat are the subjects of lines 1-2 simply on the basis of other texts such as 1.5.v and 1.10. However, unlike Walls, my interpretation of text 1.10 does not provide evidence contrary to the interpretation that Baal and Anat engage in sexual intercourse. Looking at what remains of the text, the only potential subjects that we find named are Baal, Anat, the bull (*alp*) and the Kotharot. I think we can dismiss the idea of the Kotharot involved in lines 1-2 since they are predominantly involved in the labour and birth of the child, rather than in the act of sexual union which must rather take place between the parents. It is possible that the bull is the masculine subject of line 1 and that in the lacuna of line 2 we should restore *arḥ* (cow), for example. However, given the following facts, that we find Baal and Anat paired in lines 4-5 and 7-8, that *KTU* reads a *l* at the end of the initial lacuna of line 1 which may be the final letter of *b'l*, that other texts relate the sexual exploits of Baal (irrespective of whom we believe to be his partner), and that *contra* Walls text 1.10 does not disprove that Baal and Anat engage in sexual intercourse, all weigh heavily in favour of a restoration for Baal in line 1 and Anat in line 2. If this interpretation is correct then we have a second account of sexual activity between these two deities, and the thesis of Day and Walls is negated. However, I would not hold up text 1.11 as irrefutable evidence for such activity, given the

difficulties of interpretation and the fact that the divine names have to be restored in lines 1-2 to reach this conclusion.

4.2.3. *KTU 1.13*

Text 1.13 (RS 1.6) was found during the first season of excavations on the tell at Ras Shamra (Virolleaud 1929 pl. LXVI). It measures 15.8 x 12.5 cm. and lacks the top of the recto, and hence the last few lines of the verso. The tablet itself was broken into several pieces (*TOu2* 19) and the many lacunae hinder our understanding of the text (Caquot 1978 14*). An unusual feature of the tablet is that almost all of the lines, except 14, 17-20 and 22, are ruled off from each other by a horizontal stroke dragged across the width of the tablet.

The goddess Anat is one of the principle characters of this narrative, but the difficulties faced in attempting to translate this damaged text have led to the situation that the number of interpretations is almost equal to the number of commentators who have attempted the task. A particularly detailed analysis of the text and the history of its interpretation is provided by del Olmo Lete (1981a).

- 1) []xx
 2) []*h*m**.⁴⁴ *t*ld* ... give birth (?) ...

⁴⁴This word is poorly preserved with very few wedges visible. A common suggestion is to restore *rh̄m tld*, but the claim that *rh̄m* can be used as an independent epithet of the goddess (e.g. de Moor 1980, del Olmo Lete 1981a) is far from certain, since it occurs in only one context in which Anat's compassion is of primary importance (see my discussion above). *TOu2* (21) suggests *bh̄m* "dans l'ardeur (génésiq)" . If we compare two other birth scenes, *KTU* 1.17.i.40f. and 1.23.51f., we see a pattern in the sequence of verbs used:

1.17.i.40f.	<i>nšq</i>	[...]	<i>hbq</i>	<i>h̄mh̄m</i>	[...]	<i>kn</i>	<i>h̄mh̄m</i>	<i>kn</i>
1.23.51f.	<i>nšq</i>	<i>hr</i>	<i>hbq</i>	<i>h̄mh̄m</i>	<i>qnš</i>	<i>wld</i>		

The damage to the text is such that we cannot say with any certainty what was originally written. The restoration of *rh̄m* as the noun 'womb' is a possibility, since we have a verb which deals with birth. On the other hand, from the above comparison of similar birth scenes, *bh̄m* is also a likely candidate.

3) [h*rm. tn. ym 4) m*(?) ⁴⁵	... massacre ⁴⁶ two days,
šx[y*mm.	[Fell three ⁴⁷] days,
lk. 5) h*r*g. ar*[y*mm. ⁴⁸	Go, slay [four] days.
bšr. 6) k*p*. šsk. [].x.	Sever ⁴⁹ hands, pour out [blood], ⁵⁰
l hbsk. 7) *tk. riš* ⁵¹ [.]l* mhrk	to your belt attach the heads of your enemies. ⁵²

⁴⁵Virolleaud's (1929 pl. LXVI) transcription shows an initial *t** but *KTU* reads an initial *m**. An examination of a slide of the tablet reveals damage to the tablet at this point; before the break there is the beginning of a horizontal wedge whilst the lacuna is larger than that indicated by Virolleaud which allows the possibility of an *m*. Caquot's (1978 14*) suggestion of *tš* as an imperative of a root *ntš* was replaced in *TOu2* (22) by *tš[h]* "égorger" [to slit] (*TOu2* 22 n.7 states that it reads *tš[h]* with del Olmo Lete, but del Olmo Lete 1981a and *MLC* reads *š[h]* without the preformative *t*, which is instead taken as the final *m* of *ymm*!). However, del Olmo Lete (1981a 53) points out the grammatical necessity for a dual or plural form of *ym* after the numeral *tn*. In this case the initial grapheme is read *m* and taken as the plural ending of *ymm*, and the new lexeme begins with *š*. Both *š[h]* 'massacre' (del Olmo Lete 1981a 51), and *špl* 'throw down' (*ARTU* 138) are plausible suggestions.

⁴⁶There is enough room in the preceding lacuna for seven to eight graphemes which makes it difficult to determine the link between the preceding verb *tlđ* and what follows. Here, the *rm* is clearly visible but only the lower part of the first grapheme remains. Caquot (1978 14*) suggests the adverb *ašrm*, but I remain unconvinced by his stichometrical analysis. De Moor (1980 306) suggests "to devote to the ban" as a parallel to *hrg* in line 5. Del Olmo Lete (1981a 54) translates "percer" [to pierce, penetrate], cf. ar. *ḥarama* 'to split, break' also as a parallel with *hrg* (*TOu2* 22 "massacre").

⁴⁷There is enough space in the lacuna for approximately five or six graphemes. The presence of *ymm* after the lacuna suggests that a numeral has been lost parallel to the *tn* of the previous line, and given the common poetic device of *n || n + 1*, it is possible that we should restore the numeral *tl̄t*, and this leaves enough room for the end of the preceding verb.

⁴⁸Virolleaud (1929 pl. LXVI) shows one vertical wedge after the lacuna which Cazelles (1956 51) takes to be the final wedge of the grapheme *l*, and restores *ar[h ḡ]lmm*. However, examination of the slide clearly shows this to be the grapheme *y* (*KTU*) which allows the reconstruction *arb' ymm*.

⁴⁹*SP* (95) translates *bšr* "with vehemence", an adjective describing Anat's battle, but de Moor (1980 307) translates "in anguish/frustration", postulating that the anguish of Anat is caused by her inability to bear children. I prefer to see this as a verb syntactically parallel to *šsk* and *'tk*, and cognate with בצר (Cazelles 1956 51).

⁵⁰*TOu2* (22) suggests "those who plunder you" taking *šsk* as a participle form with 2fs pronominal suffix and cognate with BH שׁוּבָה 'plunder, take booty', cf. Jer. 30:16 שׁוּבָה (cf. the earlier opinion of Caquot 1978 15* and his reference to Cassuto 1971 117). However, this leaves the lacuna blank and presents a poor prosodic division of lines six and seven. Analysis of the slide of this tablet shows room for two graphemes and we must take account of this in our translation. Del Olmo Lete (1981a 54) raises the possibility that it is a corrupt form of *šns* from the example of *KTU* 1.3.ii.12, but favours the suggestion of Cazelles (1956 51), who takes *šsk* as the Š-causative of *nsk* 'pour' followed by *dm* 'blood' in the lacuna. Walls (1992 140) follows del Olmo Lete's first suggestion and takes it as an infinitive construct in which the middle *n* has assimilated. I follow Cazelles (1956 51).

- 8) *w** 'p. l *dr**[] *nšrk*. Fly at the [side]⁵³ of your hawk(s),
 9) *w rbs*. l *grk*. *inbb*. Settle on your mountain *inbb*.
 10) *k*t*⁵⁴ *grk*. *ank*. *y*d't*. The base of your mountain I truly know!
 11) *k*(?)t*.⁵⁵ *atn*. *at*. *m₁bk*. Behold, I gave you your dwelling,
u(?)b*(?)xg*/.*⁵⁶ 12) [] *m*m*.⁵⁷ *rm*. in the high heavens.
lk. *prz*. *k*(?)t*.⁵⁸ 13) [*k*]*bkbm*.⁵⁹ Go,⁶⁰ crush⁶¹ the pedestals of the stars.

⁵¹Virolleaud's (1929 pl. LXVI) transcription shows no indication of *š*, and from examination of the slide we see that the lacuna breaks off the end of the grapheme *i*. The lacuna is wide enough for one or two graphemes which makes possible the restoration *riš* or the plural *rišt*. Compare *KTU* 1.3.ii where we find singular forms of *kp* and *riš* rather than plurals.

⁵²If the parallelism of these two cola appears to be somewhat unbalanced, perhaps we could take *lhbsk* as a parallel to *lmhrk*. In this case, we could postulate a noun meaning 'prisoner' from the root *hbs* 'to bind' (rather than 'sash' as in 1.3.ii) and translate "Sever hands! || Pour out the blood of your prisoners, || attach the heads of your enemies". However, the similarities between this passage and that in 1.3.ii would seem to argue against this.

⁵³Virolleaud's (1929 pl. LXVI) transcription and an examination of the slide show space for only one grapheme. *Tou2* (22) restores *dr'k* 'your arm'. However, there does not appear to be sufficient space in the lacuna to restore 'k', especially since the final wedge of the *r* has also to be fitted. A single ' (CTA) is more likely and *ARTU* (138) translates "by the side" pointing to the Akkadian usage *ina ahi* (*CAD A/1.208*).

⁵⁴Virolleaud (1929 pl. LXVI) has only the final horizontal wedge of the first grapheme and the indication of a preceding horizontal wedge, which leads Cazelles (1956 53), Caquot (1978 15*) and *Tou2* (23) to read *at* as an imperative of *atw* 'to come'. De Moor (1980 307) and del Olmo Lete (1981 52) follow *KTU* and read *kt*, and an examination of the slide suggests that this reading may be correct.

⁵⁵Virolleaud (1929 pl. LXVI) has *n* after a lacuna, at the beginning of the line, and this is confirmed by examination of a colour slide of the tablet, so *KTU*'s reading is rejected (de Moor 1980 305). Perhaps we should read [*h*]*n* 'behold'. Compare El's message to Anat here with the formulaic exchanges between them in *KTU* 1.3.v.19f. and 1.18.i.5f., where we find the themes of 'knowing' and 'dwellings': El *knows* the character of his daughter and Anat threatens El's *dwelling*. Again, in *KTU* 1.6.iii Anat approaches El to seek *knowledge* about Baal's well-being. In 1.3.v and 1.4.iv we find El described by the adjective *hkm* (wise).

⁵⁶The tablet at this point is very poorly preserved, but we do find what may be *u* or *b* after the word divider and beginning the next lexeme. De Moor (1980 307) reads *m₁bk bgg* as a reference to a supposed practice of erecting temporary shrines on the roof of the temple during the New Year Festival. An examination of a colour slide of the tablet suggests to me that we should read *bm* with *KTU*'s final *g* or word divider being the vertical stroke of the *m*. In this reading we have the preposition with suffixed *-m*, perhaps added for reasons of assonance with the following [*š*]*mm rm*.

⁵⁷Reading *šmm*.

⁵⁸Caquot (1978 15*) reads *pt* 'fracasser' (to smash), cf. hb. פִּתַּח and ar. *fatta*. From the slide we can see one horizontal wedge near the top of the line under which is the lacuna, and after the lacuna we have one horizontal wedge of such a larger proportion that it is likely to be a separate grapheme, and looks very similar to the final *t* of the line below. Both are valid possibilities but considerations of prosody favour the reading of *KTU*.

⁵⁹Virolleaud (1929 pl. LXVI) shows only the final *bm* preceded by the end of what appears to be a horizontal wedge coming out of the lacuna. An examination of the slide reveals more; the lacuna is approximately one grapheme wide and this is followed by what appears to be *b* or *d* - the confusion arises from there being three vertical wedges but only two horizontal ones at their base. A following *k* is clearly visible and we read []*b/dkbm*, which would suggest that the first visible sign is a scribal error for *b*. I therefore accept *KTU*'s reading of [k]*bkbm* and take it as a genitive in the phrase *kt kbkbm* 'throne-base/pedestal of the stars' (del Olmo Lete 1981a).

⁶⁰This is usually taken as a preposition with pronominal suffix although *Tou2* admits that the imperative *hlk* is also possible. In line four we have a colon beginning with the imperative *lk*, followed by a second imperative, and I believe this is the structure we have here.

⁶¹This lexeme presents us with some difficulty. It may well be tempting to see in *prz* an imperative cognate with BH פָּרַץ 'break through, break up'; however, פָּרַץ has an Arabic cognate *frs* which rules this out (*UT* 5.13 demonstrates Hebrew *s* and Arabic *s* points to Ugaritic *s* and not *z* as we have here, cf. *CML* 2 140) since the common *s* points to an Ugaritic cognate with the form *prš*, found in *KTU* 1.23.70 (cf. *MLC* 612 who proposes *prš* as a cognate with Hebrew פָּרַץ). The phonological equivalencies can be summed up in the following table (*UT* 5.13):

Ugaritic	Hebrew	Arabic	Akkadian
z or ġ	s	z	s
z or s	s	d	s
s	s	s	s

This shows us that whilst an Ugaritic *z* may be cognate with a hb. *s*, it is cognate only with ar. *z* or *d*. Cazelles (1956 53) reads *p* as a conjunction followed by the verb *rz*. Del Olmo Lete (1981a 55) points out the possibility of reading this lexeme as *prp*, by splitting the final grapheme, which provides us with a cognate of Arab. *rafa'a* '(se) lever' and a verb parallel to the previous *rm*, which he takes to be an imperative. He also mentions the possibility of a root *rz* 'courir, parcourir' cf. hb. רָצָה, but is undecided, since he retains both options in his translation. Caquot (1978 15*) reads *rz* as an imperative of a verb cognate with ar. *radḍa*, hb. רָצַח 'crush'. De Moor (1980 308) suggests that this is a scribal error for *prq* cognate with akk. *parakku* 'cella, sanctuary'. He supports the shift *q* to *k* with ug. *qrš*, akk. *karašu*. Since I take the previous *rm* as an adjective, del Olmo Lete's (1981a 56) suggestion that this is parallel to an imperative *rm* is unnecessary. I favour the explanation of Caquot which sees this as a conjunction *p*, with an imperative of the verb *rz(z)* meaning 'to break, smash' since it fits in with my understanding of the overall passage at this point, although the damaged state of the text rules out any firm conclusions.

⁶²This may be 2s *yqtl* of *npl* 'fall, be killed'. If the subject is Anat, it would seem odd that she is asked to 'fall', unless we accept the hb. connotation of פִּלַּח with the meaning of 'fall upon, attack' (cf. Jer. 48.32, Josh. 11.7, Job 1.15). However, another solution presents itself if we parse

this verb as 3fs/p *yqtl*. In Is. 9.9 we find the phrase, לָבָנִים נָפְלוּ 'bricks have fallen', as a description of destruction. Perhaps here the same imagery is used of the destruction of the *kt kbkbm*, with the jussive sense, 'may it/they fall like a brick/bricks'; a graphic image of the destruction of the celestial pedestal(s).

⁶³De Moor's (1971a 350) explanation for *lbnt* 'white petals' remains unconvincing since the more usual 'bricks' fits the context just as well, if not better. The imagery used in this verse brings to mind that of Is. 14.12f. where we find an invective against the King of Babylon (see the remarks of Caquot 1978 16* who states that Ginsberg was the first to note the similarity between these two texts). In this passage, remarkable for its colourful allusions to Canaanite myth, we read that this character has 'fallen from heaven' (v.12a נָפַל מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם) and has been 'cut down to earth' (v.12b נִגְדַע מִן הָאָרֶץ) and this same sequence of verbs, נָפַל and נִגְדַע is also found in Is. 9.9 where we have already pointed out the link with *tpl* above. In Is. 14 it is the king who has 'fallen' down the vertical axis of sacrality; literally from heaven, to earth, to Sheol! This is because he ascended above the stars of El (כִּוְכַב־יֵאֵל) and set his throne (כִּסֵּא) on the Mount of assembly (בְּהֶרֶם־מוֹעֵד) on the flanks of Saphon (יִרְכַּת־צִפּוֹן). In Hebrew myth stars have a special place as leaders (the oracle of Baalam in Num. 24.17 sees a star who will lead Israel in its struggles), or as gods (see for example Am. 5.26 כִּוְכַב אֱלֹהֵיכֶם 'your star-god', and the scene in Jud. 5.20 where it is said that the stars fought on behalf of Israel [Weinfeld 1983]), and *kbkbm* is an image used of the gods in Ugaritic myth also. See *KTU* 1.19.iv.22f. where *pšt* speaks of her father making offerings to the gods || stars, and 1.10.i.3-4 where *bn il* seems to parallel *phr kbkbm*, as well as 1.43.3-4 where we find the group *ilm kbkbm*. See also the comments of Caquot (1978 16*) who believes that Anat fights the group known as the *bn atrt* in *KTU* 1.6.v.1, and designated *kbkbm* in the present text. He also suggests the possible restoration of *bn ilm* at the beginning of line 14 as a suitable parallel to *kbkbm*. In our Ugaritic narrative, it is possible that *kbkbm* is actually a poetical designation of the sons of El, the *kt kbkbm* being the pedestals (thrones) upon which the assembly of the gods sit. This passage, along with *KTU* 1.6.v.1f., may then provide further background to Athirat's anxious exclamation in *KTU* 1.4.ii.21f.

⁶⁴Virolleaud's (1929 pl. LXVI) transcription shows only the *m* clearly, preceded by the top half of a vertical wedge, and this is confirmed by examination of the slide which also shows enough room in the lacuna for perhaps three to four graphemes before the *m*. The text is too damaged to know for certain what belongs here. De Moor (1971a 349) suggests *yrhm* 'moons' as a parallel to *kbkbm*, but later (1979 650) suggests that we need a parallel to 'falling stars' and therefore reads *srhm*, cognate with Akk. *sehrū* 'flare, sudden luminosity' used of astral bodies: he suggests we take this as 'comets'. Del Olmo Lete (1981a 56) thinks that we must look for a material used in the construction of (mythical) palaces, such as *ilqsm* 'gems' or *hrsm* '(ingots of) gold'. Wyatt (*oral communication*) has suggested 'comets' cf. hb. שָׁבַח which parallels כִּוְכַב 'star' in Num. 24.17.

⁶⁵De Moor (1971a 350) takes this as a cognate of hb. יָרֵךְ ar. *wark* 'haunch, thigh'. He argues that since the phrase *kyrkt 'tqbm* must modify his idea of 'falling moons', parallel to stars falling like *lbnt*, and noting the similarity in shape between haunches and the seeds of the ash, he translates 'samaras of the ash'. Del Olmo Lete (1981a 56) suggests that the phrase *yrkt 'tqbm* may be some kind of building material parallel to 'bricks', such as 'poutres des frènes' [beams of Ash].

⁶⁶Cazelles (1956 53) points out that the spelling is confirmed by a PN in *KTU* 4.63 '*tqbt*, and sees it as a designation of those creatures which Baal encountered in the desert in *KTU* 1.12.

- 15) []m*. t*⁶⁷zp*n. l pit. ... at/to the edge (?)
- 16) m⁶⁸[]m*[]t*m. w mdbht. ... sacrifice ...
- 17) hr. []l. kbkbm ... over the stars
- 18) n'm.⁶⁹ []slm. the gracious one ...
- trthš*[] 19) btl. 'nt*. The Maiden Anat washed herself,
- tpt⁷⁰*. ⁷⁰tb⁷¹[] 20) limm. [ybm] (?) limm cleansed herself.

Caquot (1978 16*) translates "Les Fortes", and explains it as a variant of the Arabic root *taqafa* and Aramaic תִּקִּי 'strong'. 'Les Fortes' is an epithet of the adversaries of Baal and Anat (*TOu2* 25). De Moor (1971a 350) states that in *KTU* 1.17.vi.20 the wooden core of a composite bow is *tqbm* growing in the Lebanon, and that archaeological evidence suggests this is the Ash tree (but cf. Margalit 1989 303f.), so here in text 13 he suggests a form of *tqb* 'to pierce' with prefixed '.

⁶⁷Del Olmo Lete (1981a 57) and *TOu2* follow Rin who relates this verb to Arabic *ḍafana* 'aller, entrer'. De Moor (1980 308) translates 'drip' and states this is a hyper-correct spelling of a root *nzp* / *ntp*. Another possibility is a cognate with hb. צַרַּךְ and aram. צַרַּךְ 'flow'.

⁶⁸The second grapheme is clearly marked but considerably smaller in proportion to surrounding examples. For a summary of the attempts at reconstruction of the text down to line 17 see del Olmo Lete (1981a and *MLC*). He notes the hypothetical nature of all attempts due to the very broken state of the tablet.

⁶⁹Cazelles (1956 54) restores *n'm[t i]llm* as a mistake for *n'mt ilm* which he treats as an epithet of Anat, "la plus en faveur des dieux". However, examination of the slide reveals a word divider after the *m* (*KTU*) and a lacuna wide enough for three to four graphemes. Also, the size, shape and distance from the lacuna of the first two vertical wedges suggests this is a *š* rather than the end of a *l*.

⁷⁰Whilst Cazelles' (1956 54) suggestion to read *tkr* 's'agenouiller' is possible since the cluster of wedges which are transliterated *pt* are very similar to that of *k*, in this instance the wedges are inordinately long for a *k*, and despite the final horizontal wedge being in contact with the preceding upper wedge, orthographically the first two wedges are more akin to *p* than any example of *k*. De Moor (1980 308) suggests a Dt stem of *pr* 'to make oneself the best, to beautify oneself'. I prefer Caquot (1978 16*), who suggests the Arabic cognate 'iftaraḡa, 'to pour water on oneself', which provides us with a Gt verb in parallel to *trthš*.

⁷¹If we accept *tpt* as a Gt verb then we are left with *tb* []limm as an epithet of Anat in parallel with *btl* 'nt. Cazelles (1956 54) restores *td(t) limm*, and takes it as "nursemaid/breast of the peoples", as a parallel to *ybm* limm. De Moor (1980 308f.) believes this is a direct reference to Anat's role as "Harlot of the world", whereas *TOu2* (25) prefers to render *limm* as 'princes' rather than 'peoples', and therefore sees this as a reference to Anat's role as protectress of the kingship. However, nowhere else do we find this as an epithet of Anat (del Olmo Lete 1981a 57), and the broken nature of the text hinders our certainty on this passage. On the tablet, after the *t*, we find two vertical wedges with two horizontal wedges at their base; the classic form of the grapheme *b*. Unfortunately, the tablet is broken immediately after the final vertical wedge, so we are unsure whether this was the grapheme *b* or *d*. There is space in the lacuna for at least one other grapheme, but may not have actually contained one. Del Olmo Lete's (1981a 57) suggestion that *t* may in fact be a mistake for *y* and that what was intended was *ybm* is very attractive since it restores the familiar epithet of Anat (see my discussion of this difficult phrase above). There is

w* t'l. 'm*. il[] 21) abh.

hž*r*. p* 'lk. yh*/l*(?)x[]

22) š*m*'k. l* arh.

w bn. []⁷⁴ 23) limm.

q*l. b udnk.

w*[]r*[]x⁷⁵ 24) k rtqt*. mrġt

And she went up to El her father.

The court - your handiwork⁷² - [is good!] (?)

Hear for yourself,⁷³ O Cow,

And understand, [ybmt] limm,

The voice in your ear.

[Know?] that you have bound⁷⁶ evil,⁷⁷

space enough in the lacuna for *m* and perhaps the *t* was written around the edge of the tablet, as we find for other letters in lines such as 29, 31, 32, 34, etc.

⁷²Cognate of hb. לַעֲשֶׂה 'do, make', or לַעֲשֵׂה 'deed, work' with 2s pronominal suffix. Caquot (1978 17*) reads *p 'l-k yf[h]* "Oui, que te soit favorable celui qui t'écoute". ARTU (139) translates "may the residence - your work - be fine". Del Olmo Lete (1981a 58) notes that this is probably some form of salutation addressed by Anat to her father.

⁷³In KTU 1.4.v.59f. we find the couplet: *šm' laliyn b'l || bn lrkb 'rpt*. This demonstrates the parallelism *šm' || bn*, each followed by a vocative. However, in the present text we find what appears to be a second person pronoun suffixed to the first verb which presents us with a difficulty. If we abandon the *k* as scribal error, then we have the acceptable parallel phrase "hear O cow, understand [ybmt] limm". This reading also makes sense of the second singular pronominal suffix on *udn*: *arh* is asked to listen to "the voice/sound in your ears". On the other hand, if we retain the *k* as the second singular pronominal suffix, we might translate something like "he will/may he hear you", or "he will/may he listen to the cow" || "and understand the ? limm || the voice in your ears". De Moor (1980 309) circumvents this difficulty by positing a juncture at this point in the text; the narrative, according to him, now breaks into an imperative address by someone beginning a prayer to Anat. Perhaps del Olmo Lete's (1981a 58) suggestion of an imperative form with a dative suffix provides an acceptable compromise between the obvious parallelism between *šm'* and *bn* and the following vocatives on the one hand, and the pronominal suffix on the other.

⁷⁴Unfortunately the corner of the tablet has broken off, losing the end of lines 22-23. Given the outward projection of the two surviving corners of this face, we can assume enough space on the face to accommodate three graphemes, and as I noted above, the frequency of lines written around onto the edge of this tablet is such that there is a good chance that a final *t* was on the edge. There is the possibility that instead of the full form of the title *ybmt limm*, El used a shortened form, *l limm* for example (compare Aqhat's use of *yblt* in 1.17.vi.34), and although this would be very unusual, it is matched by his use of the vocative *arh* in the parallel colon. However, it is perhaps better not to restore an unusual form.

⁷⁵Caquot (1978 17*) suggests the conjunction *wn*. De Moor (1980 306) reads *w'nn* 'answer me'. Del Olmo Lete (1981a 58) proposes some form of the root 'rb with emphatic *w*. Looking at the slide, it is apparent that the top right corner of the verso has broken away: all that remains visible is the initial *w*. Unfortunately, not having access to the tablet itself leaves me unable to verify the reading of KTU. However, given the proximity of the verbs *šm'* and *bn*, it is possible that some form of the verb *yd'* should be restored. We can see from KTU 1.3.iii.23f. the paralleling of *bn* with *yd'*, and from KTU 1.6.iii.8 and 1.16.i.33, we see the verb *yd'* followed by the conjunction *k*.

⁷⁶De Moor (1980) and del Olmo Lete (1981a) are in complete agreement on the stichometric division of the text at this point, but their interpretation of the individual words is

25) <i>k d lbšt. bi*r.</i>	That you have been clothed ⁷⁸ with light. ⁷⁹
<i>mlak</i> 26) <i>šmm. tmr*. zbl.</i>	The heavenly messenger ⁸⁰ will bless ⁸¹ the prince, ⁸²
<i>mlk</i> ⁸³ 27) <i>šm*m*. tlak*[.]t*/h*l.</i>	The heavenly messenger will send him strength. ⁸⁴

completely different. De Moor (1980 306) translates “because the vulva of the wife is closed up” stating that in Arabic *rataqa* may denote a woman who has not engaged in sexual intercourse (Lane 1027). However, this is not the common meaning of the verb, which has the meaning of ‘to bind’, cf. hb. קָרַק. Del Olmo Lete (1981a 59) accepts this more basic meaning following Cazelles, Caquot, Rin.

⁷⁷Caquot (1978 17*) notes the difficulty of *CTA* in reading this word, but decides on the reading *mr̥gt*, which is confirmed by the slide to which I had access. Caquot suggests a root **rġġ* meaning ‘perversion, mal’ related to hb. רַע and akk. *raggu*. De Moor (1980 309) translates “wife”, cognate with akk. *marhītu* ‘wife, lover’. Other possibilities are cognates with hb. רוץ ‘run’ and arm. ܪܘܬ which as a verbal noun may have the meaning of ‘runner, royal body guard, escort’, etc. (cf. *UT* 5.13 for the consonantal shift ug. ḡ = hb. ṣ = arm. ṭ). Or hb. רָעַר ar. *rġ* ‘war cry, shout, blast of horn’. However, Caquot may well be correct in the light of Anat’s speech of *KTU* 1.3.iii.

⁷⁸De Moor (1980 306) translates *lbš* “covered up” in the special sense relating to the condition of a woman’s vulva. The verb has the more basic meaning of ‘to put on, wear’, cf. *KTU* 1.5.v.23, 1.12.ii.47, 1.19.iv.44. Also cf. hb. לָבַשׁ which can refer not only to articles of clothing but be used in the metaphorical sense of being clothed with some attribute (see *BDB* for examples).

⁷⁹De Moor (1980 309) suggests a cognate with hb. בִּיאַר ‘well, pit’ and proposes this is used as a designation of a wife or lover. I accept the majority opinion of preposition plus ‘r’ ‘light’. The initial *i*-aleph may be due to the influence of the prefixed preposition *b-* which was probably pronounced /bi-/ (Segert 1984 56.21), although the alephs usually take the preceding vowel only when the aleph is silent.

⁸⁰Caquot (1978 17*) suggests that *mlak šmm* is the “messagère céleste” who he believes to be Shapshu, although we would expect a feminine form *mlakt*. *ARTU* (140) translates “angels of heaven”. The phrase could be either plural or singular.

⁸¹Caquot (1978 18*) sees this as an imperfect of the root *mr(r)* ‘bénir’ whilst del Olmo Lete (1981a 59) suggests a G stem passive of the root *mr(r)* ‘passer, aller, partir’ cf. ar. *marra*, as a parallel to the following *tlak*. Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín (1973 122) suppose this is from a root *mrr* III which parallels *brk*, but Dietrich and Loretz (1977 53) present the alternative view of *mrr* II “weggehen, fortschicken”. I prefer the stichometric division of *ARTU* at this point (although not the translation) which reads *mlak* at the end of line 26 as a parallel to that of line 25. For an analysis of the root *mr* in the Semitic language family see Pardee (1978) who notes (274) that in Ugaritic the verb ‘bless’ only ever occurs with one *r*.

⁸²De Moor (1980 310) suggests the literal translation “impregnator, husband” with *zbl* as a participle of *zbl* ‘to impregnate’, cf. Gen. 30.20. However, the more usual interpretation of ‘prince, noble’ is preferred.

amr. 28) *bnkm. k bk*[r.]*

*z*b*l. am.* 29) *r*k*m**.⁸⁷

*ag*zrt. *[n]r**.⁸⁸ *arh.* 30) *b'l.*

I bless⁸⁵ your son⁸⁶ like a firstborn,

Like a prince I bless him for you.

[Anat], cow of Baal, was eager,⁸⁹

⁸³Dietrich and Loretz (1977 53) suggest that *zbl* and *mlk* are alternative readings. However, I agree with de Moor (1980 310) who restores *ml<a>k* in order to obtain "two well balanced stichoi".

⁸⁴*ARTU* (140) suggests reading *hl* 'strength', which gives a good parallelism with the previous line. According to this interpretation, the *mlak šmm* blesses the prince, and sends him strength.

⁸⁵Caquot (1978 18*) understands Anat as the subject of this verb and states that she blesses the sons of those who invoke her. However, there is no indication that it is Anat who speaks; in fact, previous lines suggest the speaker to be El rather than Anat (*ARTU* 140 believes she has taken over the prerogative of El). This apparent switch from the blessing of the *mlak šmm* to that of El is not inconsistent with the general motif of blessing or announcement of birth; in *KTU* 1.15.iii.17, after the long speech of El, we also find the phrase *tbrk ilm*, which shows that blessing is not the sole prerogative of El (*contra ARTU*).

⁸⁶The *-km* suffix on this noun could either be taken as 2s with enclitic *m* (Cazelles 1956 55) or as a plural. *ARTU* (140) believes the suffix is a dual and refers to the two parents of the son whose wife is unable to bear, and who are the petitioners of this 'prayer'. Del Olmo Lete (1981a 59) also understands the suffix as plural, but suggests this assumes a marital relationship between Baal and Anat.

⁸⁷Although the text is broken, the *r* is certain and the *km* very probable, to judge from the remaining wedges. This is probably the verb *amr* broken over two lines, with a second person pronominal suffix. A 2pl object pronoun suffixed to the verb could be translated 'I shall bless you (pl.)', even though one might expect a third person singular *-h* suffix, referring to the *bn* and in parallel with the previous colon. Del Olmo Lete (1981a 59) and *ARTU* translate by taking it as a second person dative suffix: for example "I will fortify (him) for you" (*ARTU* 140). *TOu2* (26) takes the pronominal suffix at face value and translates it as a reference to the cattle of Anat: "Je vous bénirai, bétail de 'A[nat] la Génisse de Ba'al". However, it is not unusual for the blessing or announcement of children to be connected with the blessing of the parents. Cf. *KTU* 1.15.ii, where the youngest is blessed as *bkr* and Keret is also blessed. At this point, text 13 appears to contain a scene of blessing, comparable to that of *KTU* 1.15.ii.12f. and 1.17.i.24f. In each of the latter, as a result of the intercession of Baal, El pronounces his blessing on the man who desires a son, and this is swiftly followed by the announcement of the birth, using the verb *wld*. We find this verb two lines later which would suggest that we have the corresponding birth scene also. In this case, *km* could be the second plural pronominal suffix referring to the parents of the promised child.

⁸⁸This reading is very uncertain, with only the beginning of a wedge visible before the lacuna and only the very last part of a wedge after the lacuna, but cf. '*nt*' in the parallel colon. The (reconstructed) phrase, '*nt arh b'l*' could be understood as a title of Anat (*MLC*, *ARTU*). Compare the title given to Keret in *KTU* 1.15.ii.20, *n'mn glm il*, which takes the form of an epithet plus a two part construct-genitive relational identifier. In the case of Keret, he is the 'servant of El'. We might compare the phrase, *dnil mt rpi*, in the Aqhat narrative, or *ytpn mhr št*. Following this model for personal names, we could take our phrase as 'Anat, cow of Baal', thus indicating her

azrt.⁹⁰ 'nt. w**l**d*⁹¹
 31) kbdh. *l**⁹² yd' hrh.
 [*l**dh* 32) tnqt*.
 (?)b*/š*xš(?). i*(?)n*xd*/b*. p'r

Anat was eager to give birth.
 Her womb indeed knew its conception,
 Her breast its sucking.
 ... open wide/proclaimed⁹³

relationship to Baal. *TOu2* (26) divides the text differently to produce two construct genitive phrases, *agzrt* 'nt and *arḥ* b'l. However, I remain unconvinced by its prosodic division of the text.

⁸⁹All are agreed that the translation of this word presents us with a difficulty; see del Olmo Lete (1981a 60) for discussion. Dietrich and Loretz (1977 53) suggest the translation "Abbild" from the root *gzt* 'abschneiden, abkneifen', cognate with akk. *karāšu*. Coupled with their translation of *mrr* "schicken", they see the speaker sending an 'image' of Anat, where 'image' equals 'child' (Knaben). Caquot (1978 18*) relates it to an Aramaic root *gzt* which means 'herd'. De Moor (1972 II.23 n.84) suggests "eager", making a semantic leap from 'gluttony' in text 1.23 which he compares with Is. 9.19. In text 13 he parses it as a third feminine verb, "Anatu, the Cow of Ba'lu, is eager". The description of the new born gods in 1.23, with a lip to the earth and a lip to the heavens, swallowing everything before them, is strikingly reminiscent of a description given in *KTU* 1.5 of the god Mot. Thus the voracious appetite of the gracious gods is not merely an exaggerated description of divine hunger pangs, but a metaphor for the insatiable appetite of death. The physiological metaphor of appetite for strong bodily drives such as sexual intercourse is a feature of the English language, and is perhaps illustrated here for Ugaritic!

⁹⁰This is probably a mistake for *agzrt* (*TOu2*, *ARTU*, del Olmo Lete 1981a, etc.).

⁹¹De Moor (1980 310) asserts that the photograph does not support the reading of *KTU*. However, examination of the slide does not seem to substantiate his claim. A lacuna follows the word divider ending 'nt, which appears to be large enough for at least one grapheme. Projecting out of the lacuna is the end of a horizontal wedge and this is followed by a *l*. The final grapheme is damaged by a break on the surface of the tablet, however, three vertical wedges are clearly visible, and underneath the break are two horizontal wedges before another break. Taken together, it is almost certainly a *d* at this point. We cannot be sure of the first grapheme. One horizontal wedge may be *t*, *a*, *n*, *k*, *r*, or *w*, but given the following two graphemes, we almost certainly have here either *wld* or *tld*. In any case, de Moor's suggestion *lld* seems mistaken. *TOu2* (26) treats this as a subjunctive, "Que le bétail de Anat enfante". *ARTU* (140) takes this as an infinitive "Anat was eager to bear". If I am correct in my interpretation of this passage as a blessing and announcement of birth similar to that in *KTU* 1.15.ii.12f., then the blessing is usually followed by the actual birth itself, using the verb *wld*. In this text, the form of the verb may be an infinitive similar to its use in 1.15.ii. Thus we have, "Anat, cow of Baal, was eager || Anat was eager to give birth". However, unlike *ARTU* who sees this simply as a desire on the part of Anat to give birth, I take it as a report of the birth of a child, in much the same way that the birth of Keret's children is announced with the phrase, *wtqrb wld* (*KTU* 1.15.iii.20-21).

⁹²The difficulty lies in the interpretation of the prefixed *l*-; should it be taken as a negative (del Olmo Lete 1981a 60; *ARTU* 140), or as an asseverative (*TOu2* 26)? In my opinion, this is part of the fulfilment of the blessing of Anat; she has been blessed by El and promised a child, to which she now gives birth. In this case, the *l* is taken as an asseverative.

⁹³Cazelles (1956 56) suggests "nommer, donner un nom" and we find this verb in the context of a naming ceremony in *KTU* 1.1.iv.15 and 1.2.iv.11. De Moor (1980 310) refers to his

33) $y^*d^*h^*$. [] $\dot{s}gr$. glg^*l^*	his hand ⁹⁴ ... young child(?) ⁹⁵ rejoiced(?) ⁹⁶ ...
34) $a[]m$. ⁹⁷ rh . hd 'r*pt	... wind storm clouds ⁹⁸
35) gl^*/s^* [] y^*hpk . m^* [] m^*/g^*
36) s^*/t^* [] $p^*(?)/k^*(?)xx$ [] t	...
37) ...	

There is little agreement on the interpretation of text 13; one only has to compare the recent studies of de Moor (1980), del Olmo Lete (1981a) and *Tou2* to become aware of the diversity of opinion this small tablet has engendered. There is confusion even in the classification of its genre: Cazelles (1956) and Caquot (1978 and *Tou2*) class it as a Hymn to Anat; de Moor (1980) presents a complex scheme of a hymn to Anat followed by a prayer of a couple whose son is a partner in a childless marriage (with an answering oracle), followed in turn by a quotation from a mythic

earlier analysis (*SP* 119) that this means "to open wide (the mouth)", or "to proclaim" in Ugaritic. However, in this context he wishes it to mean "to open wide the vagina". This is part of his thesis which sees Anat as unable to have sexual intercourse with Baal, but Cazelles' proposal is more appropriate in the context of the naming of a child who has just been born.

⁹⁴Although there is some damage to the tablet at this point, the reading *ydh* is fairly certain. Del Olmo Lete (1981a 61) suggests that this is a synonym of *ydd/mdd* found in *KTU* 1.5.iv, with the meaning of 'beloved (of El?)'. De Moor (1980 310) prefers "his penis", although "his hand" is probably a better translation since it appears that the act of copulation has passed.

⁹⁵In *KTU* 1.15.iii.16 we find *šgrthn* designating the youngest of Keret's new-born children in the blessing of El. *ARTU* (141) treats it as an adjective meaning 'too small'. In the preceding lacuna there is enough room for three to four graphemes. This may be a reference to the new-born child, but we cannot be sure.

⁹⁶*Tou2* (27) translates "petit a roulé" [small shaped/rolled]. Cazelles (1956 56) reads *gl* and translates "se rejouir" as a parallel to *šmh*. *ARTU* (141) "rolled out". *MLC* (532) "copa", cf. hb. פָּקַד. Perhaps it is a reduplicated form of *gl* with an intensification in meaning: there is great rejoicing at the birth of the *šgr*. However, this is only speculation.

⁹⁷The lacuna is wide enough for four to five graphemes. De Moor's (1980 310) suggested reconstruction *abn gšm* and may be correct given the context of the other meteorological phenomena listed.

⁹⁸We seem to have a collection of meteorological terms with 'wind', followed by 'storm cloud' (*hdd* cognate with hb. חֲדָד and ar. *hindîd* 'storm cloud'), and 'cloud'. According to *ARTU* (141), Baal rolls out these weather conditions because of his frustration at not being able to have intercourse with Anat. However, I prefer to take the view of del Olmo Lete (1981a 61) who sees in this some kind of investiture comparable to *KTU* 1.5.v.22f.

narrative which is followed by a divine promise of hail; in contrast, del Olmo Lete (1981a) classes it as a mythic narrative. De Moor's attempt to account for the numerous shifts in the person of the verbs has resulted in an excessively complex scheme, whereas del Olmo Lete's more elegant analysis of promise-fulfilment, command-execution, takes full account of this without the need for proposing dramatic changes in the genre of the text, and is therefore to be preferred.⁹⁹

The suggestion that this text provides evidence of Anat's sexual relationship with Baal (de Moor, del Olmo Lete, etc.) has been challenged by scholars such as Caquot (1978), and more recently Day (1991 and 1992) and Walls (1992) who instead prefer to see it as evidence for Anat as a benefactress of animals. There is little doubt that the subject of birth plays a major part in the narrative, but beyond that, there is little agreement between scholars, even as to whether an actual birth is narrated, or simply the desire for a birth.

The first legible line presents us with the verb *ltd*, but the subject of this verb cannot be determined because of the extensive damage to the head of the tablet (Caquot 1978 14*). De Moor (1980) and del Olmo Lete (1981a) both restore *rh̄m* based on the assumption that Anat receives the epithet *rh̄m* in *KTU* 1.6.ii.27 and possibly *KTU* 1.23.16, 28, and that Anat is the subject of lines 27f., rather than some cattle of Anat (*contra* *TOu2*). However, the assumption that *rh̄m* is an epithet of Anat is far from certain, and I prefer the suggestion of *TOu2* (21) which tentatively restores *bh̄m*. Anat is almost certainly the subject of the verbs in the following lines given the close similarity of imagery between this text and that of 1.3.ii and the reference to

⁹⁹Walls (1992 141) comments that the continued shift in person of the verb "confuses the sense of *KTU* 1.13 as a whole". However, this is rather surprising since one need only compare this text with some of the more well known texts, such as the AB cycle for example, to realise that constantly shifting point of view is a narrative device frequently used to elevate myth above mundane *reportage*. For a discussion of the function of point of view in narrative see Berlin 1983.

flying among hawks (*nšr*) which reminds us of 1.18.iv.29f. where Anat hovers among the hawks during the attack on Aqhat. Therefore, it is not unreasonable to assume that she is also the subject of *tld*, unless we assume a scene change between lines two and three.

The question of whether it is Anat who gives birth hinges on the relationship between the *arḥ* and '*nt*: if they are to be distinguished then the answer is negative, but if we can equate the cow and Anat, as we found to be the case in text 1.10, then it is Anat who gives birth. Lines 29f. seem to narrate the 'cow of Baal' (*arḥ b'l*) giving birth. In line 20 we find *y!b[mt] limm* as the B word to the parallel *btlt 'nt*, and since directly after *limm* we find *wt'l*, i.e. a 3fs impf. verb, we can assume that it is Anat who 'goes up' to visit her father El. In lines 22-23 we find what appears to be a tricolon in which [] *limm* is the B word of a parallel pair, but in this case, the first element is *arḥ*. I consider this tricolon to be an imperative address by El to his daughter Anat (del Olmo Lete 1981a 55). In this case *larḥ* is the vocative, "O Cow!", paralleled by "[*ybmt (?)*] *limm!*", and thus it seems a distinct possibility that *arḥ* is an epithet of Anat, rather than being a cow who is not otherwise introduced.¹⁰⁰

In lines 29-30 we find *arḥ* coupled with the lexeme *agzrt*.¹⁰¹ Our only other Ugaritic context for *gẓr / agzrym* is *KTU* 1.23 where it is an appellative for the new born gods (line 58f. and 60f.), *ilmy n'mm agzrym bnym*. Whether or not *agzrym*

¹⁰⁰Even though we accept *arḥ* as an epithet of Anat in this text, we are not obliged to equate *arḥ* with Anat in every text in which it occurs. De Moor's (1979 649) interpretation of text *KTU* 1.93 as a prayer addressed to Anat (= *arḥ* of line 1) is intriguing, but there is nothing in the text itself to substantiate his claim, and it is obvious from the diverse interpretations given this text by Caquot (1979 and *TOu2*), Margalit (1984), and Dijkstra (1986), that while even the *genre* of this text is still debated, and while there is still great divergence in the translation of many of the lexemes of this text, it would be reckless to assert Anat is the *arḥ* in 1.96 simply on the basis of text 1.13.

¹⁰¹The parallel *azrt* is probably to be emended to read *agzrt*.

is to be split into *agzr ym*,¹⁰² the context is clearly that of voracious eaters. The presence of the root *gZR* coupled with the mention of right and left (line 63f. *ymn* and *šmal*) leads de Moor (1972 II.23 n.84) to compare *KTU* 1.23 with Is. 9.19, which also has the parallel pair גור and אכל. From the Hebrew text he supposes a meaning of desperation to eat, or gluttony, and from this he makes the semantic leap to 'eagerness' in the context of *KTU* 1.13; Anat is eager to bear.

The previous discussion illustrates the uncertain nature of any translation of the text at this point. Does *agzrt* signify 'image', 'cattle', or the verb 'be eager'? Concentrating solely on this particular problem cannot lead to any satisfactory solution; it needs to be examined in the context of the narrative as a whole. We have seen that in line 22 *arh* most likely refers to Anat; now we have to ask who is the subject and who the object of the verb *amr* in lines 27-29. It has been suggested that Anat speaks at this point (de Moor 1987 140, Caquot 1978 18*, Day 1991), and that she blesses the son of the parents who recite the prayer (de Moor) or those who invoke Anat (Caquot) and the cow who is about to give birth (Caquot, Day). But are we really justified in switching the direct discourse from El to Anat at this point? At the beginning of the narrative we find an address to Anat, most likely by El through his messengers (del Olmo Lete 1981a 51). This may be confirmed by lines 10-11 which in my opinion appear to be some kind of boast that the speaker knows and has given Anat her dwelling.¹⁰³ With the second first person address in lines 22f., there is no compelling reason to attribute it to Anat when it is equally justifiable to treat this

¹⁰²For a history of the differing interpretations of Ugaritic *gZR* see Dietrich and Loretz (1977). For their part, they accept *agzrym* as one word and explain it as the full spelling of a plural form.

¹⁰³De Moor's (1987 138) suggestion that these lines are spoken by a human worshipper of Anat who is referring to a booth erected for the goddess on the roof of the temple at the New Year festival seems to go beyond the evidence and the more straightforward solution of an address by El is preferable.

as El addressing Anat. As support for this latter position, El is usually the one who blesses parents and their children. The character he addresses in lines 22f. is *arḥ* || [] *limm*, which we have already seen is most likely to be Anat; not surprising since it appears she has been summoned by El. When, therefore, in line 27f. we read *amr bnkm*, it is reasonable to assume that the speaker is still El and that the person he addresses is Anat, in which case El makes a direct reference to a son (*bn*) of Anat. The pronominal suffix seems to be a second plural which causes problems for some commentators. The possibility that it is a second singular with enclitic *m* was proposed by Cazelles (1956 55) and although this is possible, the plural form poses no major problems since El may be referring to Anat and Baal as the parents.

It is obvious from the previous discussion that we cannot make definitive statements about the role of Anat and the *arḥ* in this text because of the problems encountered in translation. On balance however, I believe it can be demonstrated that in this text at least, *arḥ* is an epithet of Anat, and that what is narrated is the promise of the birth of a child to Anat. The alternative, namely that the cow is to be distinguished from Anat, and that the goddess acts as benefactress to cattle, is proposed by Day (1991 and 1992) and Walls (1992 139f.). Day's (1991 143) thesis is that Anat, as huntress, is concerned for the increase of game and of the herd, and accepting Caquot's proposal for *agzrt* as 'cattle' she asserts that text 13 illustrates Anat's concern to increase the herd. Walls (1992 142) also points to the "interpretive crux" of the text in understanding *agzrt*. He does little more than outline the alternative suggestions and rests with Caquot's translation of *agzrt* as 'bovine'.

Within the constraints of an article, Day (1991 and 1992) has little opportunity to discuss text 1.13, but she does appear to accept Caquot's translation with little critical evaluation. Walls (1992) also seems reluctant to discuss this text critically and simply presents alternative scholarly views. Although he is less assured than Day, he appears to accept Caquot's views on the text without further discussion,

dismissing the notion that the cow and Anat are one and the same in this text. He writes (143f.),

As Caquot (1978:18*) notes, *KTU* 1.13 may supplement the available information concerning the relationship of Anat and Baal's heifer, but it offers no proof of their identity.

As I have attempted to demonstrate above, although we cannot be entirely certain, text 1.13 does present a strong case for the identification of Anat and *arh*, and therefore can be taken as evidence that Anat, as a fully developed female within the Ugaritic pantheon, could become pregnant and give birth.

As for de Moor's views (followed unerringly by Korpel 1990) on the sexual nature of Anat, my understanding of this text offers no support to his idea that Anat's vagina is too small for her to engage in sexual intercourse with Baal and that she takes on the form of a cow in order to be able to mate, but that Baal is frustrated.

It is my understanding of this text that El addresses Anat in line 27f. where he blesses Anat and Baal's son. The inevitable result of such a blessing is conception and birth, narrated in lines 29f. Although the text becomes very difficult to understand, it appears that in line 32 we have a naming ceremony as we find in *KTU* 1.1.iv.15 and 1.2.iv.11 (with the verb *p'r*) which suggests that we take the particle *l-* in line 31 as an asseverative marker. This text provides us therefore with further evidence that Anat and Baal were lovers and that she bore a child for him, as we saw for text 1.10 and possibly 1.11.

4.2.4. *KTU* 1.96

Discovered in 1960, RS 22.225 measures 6 by 9 cm's with an Ugaritic text on one face and an extract from an Akkadian syllabary on the other (Virolleaud 1960 181). Astour (1988 13) believes it to be a first draft or an exercise copied from

the middle of a longer poetic composition, but *TOu2* (40) emphasises the neatness of the handwriting which may indicate that it was written by a well trained scribe.

1) 'nn ('nt).¹⁰⁴ *hlkt*.

'nn roams about,¹⁰⁵

w šnwt 2) *tp. ahh*

She/it disfigured¹⁰⁶ the beauty¹⁰⁷ of her/its brother,¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁴*KTU* reads 'nn and suggests an emendation to 'nt, but Walls (1992 211) states that "the text clearly shows 'nh". Walls' transcription reads 'nt(!) but in footnote 42 he writes,

'nh is hardly a simple orthographic error for 'nt, and one would not expect the scribe to make a mistake in the first word of a composition. Scholars have apparently not made sense of the actual writing, and thus 'correct' the text in order to provide a logical subject for the feminine verbal forms. Accordingly, the unspecified 'brother' of the subject in line 2 is identified as Baal.

Walls then proceeds to cite the opinion of his supervisor, P. Kyle McCarter, Jr., who believes that 'nh should be understood as 'his/her eye', whilst *ahh* is to be understood 'its brother', in the style of certain Mesopotamian riddles, and Egyptian myths concerning the Eye of Re. Walls states that McCarter's suggestion is more plausible than any other and necessitates no change in the text, but overlooks the contradiction of his own translation of the text! However, examination of a colour slide of the tablet shows quite clearly 'nn at the beginning of line 1 and not 'nh. Despite the incorrect reading of the first word by McCarter, his interpretation of this text is similar to that of del Olmo Lete (1992) who reads 'nn at the beginning of line 1 and explains this form as the noun 'n 'eye' with a determinative suffix -n (for a deictic function for the suffix -n see Dietrich and Loretz [1990 104] and their discussion of text *KTU* 1.103+ line 1). In his view, 'n has the meaning 'evil eye', cf. sum. IGI HUL, akk. *īnu lemuttu*.

¹⁰⁵Virolleaud (1960 182) reads *tlkt* in his transcription of the first line but later, when he discusses the form of the verb *šnwt*, he compares it to a previous *hlkt*, which suggests a typographical error in the publication. Despite the poor quality of Virolleaud's published photograph, it is possible to make out the sign *h* and not *t*, and this is confirmed on a slide of the tablet. *TOu2* however, follows Virolleaud's *tlkt* and attempts to explain it by suggesting that the scribe made a mistake, intending to write the imperfect but changing his mind to end with the perfect. However, this is an unnecessary hypothesis considering the reading of the tablet. The form *hlkt* is taken as a feminine participle.

¹⁰⁶Virolleaud (1960 182) proposes a root *šnw* which means 'to regard, admire' (from context). Astour (1963 5) originally suggested from context 'she hears' or like Virolleaud 'she admires', but later (1988 15) refers to ar. *sana(w)* (conjugation X) 'to find beautiful'; Lipinski (1965 56), using the same Arabic cognate, translates "Anat became more inflamed", preferring to take the verb *hlkt* as an auxiliary indicating ongoing action. *UT* 19.2448 suggests 'hastened' but warns that this is uncertain, while Sanmartín (1978 354 n.39) understands it as an Akkadian loan word *šānû(m)* V 'to trot' and translates "Anat goes, indeed she runs". De Moor takes it as a parallel to *hlk* "she went and left" cf. syr. *šēna* 'to depart' (1979 647 n.54, *ARTU*; followed by Walls 1992 212). *TOu2* translates "she celebrated" following Dahood's (1978 260) description of it as a causative *šafel* of the root *nwy*, cf. hb. **נדה* hiphil 'beautify, adorn him (with praises)' in Ex 15:2. Del Olmo Lete (1992 10) appeals to a root **šnw* 'to change' and sees here the action of the evil eye in transmuting the beauty of its 'brother' (= 'neighbour'), drawing on Mesopotamian beliefs concerning the evil eye which could 'seize' the features of a person (Thomsen 1992 22). Cf. akk. *šanû* B, 1. 'to become different, strange, to change (intransitive)'; 2. 'to change one's

<i>w n'm. ahh.</i>	and the charm of her/its brother,
3) <i>k ysmm.</i>	Indeed he was very beautiful. ¹⁰⁹
<i>tspi. širh 4) l. bl hrb.</i>	She/it eats ¹¹⁰ his flesh without a knife,
<i>tšt. dmh 5) l. bl. ks.</i>	she/it drinks his blood without a cup.
<i>tpnn. 'n 6) bty.</i>	The eye ¹¹¹ of the evil man ¹¹² corrupts, ¹¹³

mind, mood, to change loyalty, to defect, to become deranged, insane' (*CAD Š/I*). I take this as a transitive (D stem?) 3fs perfect. The *akk.* lexeme contains the idea of change for the worse, which is in keeping with the effects of an evil eye, thus I translate *šmw* as 'disfigure' since this retains the negative connotations of both the verb and the evil eye, and suits the object 'beauty'.

¹⁰⁷*tp* is commonly understood as a noun in construct with *ahh* and translated either 'tambourine, timbrel' or 'beauty'. Virolleaud (1961 182) leaves *tp* untranslated but suspects that it should be taken as a parallel of *n'm*. Astour (1963 5) argues for 'timbrel'. Albright (1968 115 n.54) suggests that *tp* is a substantive with *t-* prefix of the root *wpy*, cf. *hb.* 𐤕𐤏𐤍 'be fair, beautiful'. This gives excellent parallelism with *n'm* 'grace, charm'. He is followed by Pope (1977 358) and *TOu2*, "la beauté". Lipinski (1965) suggests an altogether more allegorical meaning for the same root, citing Jerome's translation of 𐤕𐤏𐤍 in Ez. 28.13 with "*foramina tua*". Lipinski states that the Latin *foramina* commonly refer to orifices or organs of the body and believes that 𐤕𐤏𐤍 𐤕𐤏𐤍 in the Exodus passage demonstrates that *tp* is by antithesis the male genitals: in other words, *tp* is a metaphor for the penis of Baal! *KTU* 1.108.3-4 demonstrates an instance of *tp* as 'tambourine, timbrel', as it appears in a list of musical instruments: *knr*, *tlb*, *tp* and *mšltm*, and again in *KTU* 1.113.1, 5 where *tp* is paralleled with *tlbm* 'flutes' (c.f. Astour 1963 5, Kitchen 1977 139-140). On the other hand, in our passage *tp* is paralleled with *n'm* whose basic meaning is that of 'beauty, grace, charm' which suggests that Albright's interpretation may indeed be correct. Walls (1992 213) argues for *tp* as a 3ms verb from the root *ph* 'to see', which should be understood as a jussive form where the final *h* is phonetically unnecessary, or left out by haplography. I prefer to accept the prosodic division which parallels *tp* with *n'm*, both of which are in construct with the genitive *ahh*.

¹⁰⁸Del Olmo Lete (1992 10f.) understands this in the general sense of 'fellow man', and points to the belief that the evil eye raises disputes between neighbours (Thomsen 1992 24, "You [evil eye] have thrown quarrel between good brothers"). Most other interpreters see this as a reference to Baal.

¹⁰⁹This is probably an emphatic particle prefixed to the reduplicated verb at the end of the clause and is probably intended to be intensive in meaning (or perhaps even superlative, Astour 1963 5), in which case there is no need to accept Løkkegaard's suggestion (1982 134) that it is in fact a misspelling for *ysmm* the 'beautiful ones'.

¹¹⁰*tspi* and *tšt* are commonly taken as 3fs *yqtl* verbs, with Anat as the subject. Loewenstamm (1963 131) points out that a *t-* prefix can also indicate the 3mp, although he does not venture to give a subject. Løkkegaard (1982 134) assumes the plural subject of the verb to be the 'beautiful ones', *ysmm* being a misspelling for *ysmm* found in *KTU* 1.23.2.

¹¹¹In line five '*n*' has been variously translated as 'spring' (e.g. Virolleaud 1961 184, *TOu2* 'la source'), 'eye' (e.g. de Moor 1979 647f. and *ARTU*, del Olmo Lete 1992), 'gaze' (Astour 1988) and '(sexual) organ' (e.g. Lipinski 1965 58 cf. ar. '*ain*').

'n <i>btt</i> .	(as does) the eye of the evil woman.
<i>tpnn</i> 7) 'n. <i>mhr</i> .	It corrupts the eye of the meeting, ¹¹⁴
'n. <i>phr</i>	the eye of the assembly, ¹¹⁵
8) 'n. <i>tgr</i> .	the eye of the gatekeeper.
'n. <i>tgr</i> 9) l <i>tgr</i> . <i>ttb</i> .	May the eye of the gatekeeper return to the gatekeeper.
'n. <i>phr</i> 10) l <i>phr</i> . <i>ttb</i> .	May the eye of the assembly return to the assembly.
'n. <i>mhr</i> 11) l <i>mhr</i> . <i>ttb</i> .	May the eye of the meeting return to the meeting.
'n. <i>bty</i> 12) l <i>bty</i> . <i>ttb</i> .	May the eye of the evil man return to the evil man.
'n. [<i>btt</i>] 13) l <i>btt</i> . <i>t*[tb</i>	May the eye of the [evil woman return] to the evil woman.
'n <i>tgr</i>]

The meaning of the first few lines of this text are obscure, but one thing is clear; the literal translation of lines 3-5 tells us that flesh is eaten and blood is

¹¹²Astour (1963 7) translates 'goods' from the Akkadian *bûšû* suggesting that Anat casts her eye over goods at a market place before carrying out some action that has now been lost (see also Astour 1988 21). Lipinski (1965 57) compares it to akk. *bašû* 'to be, to exist, to grow great' and causative 'to create, engender', and together with his idea for 'n, translates "L'organe de l'engendrement". Del Olmo Lete (1992 11) relates it to aram. 'yn' *byšt'/byš'* that appears in magical texts as a designation of the evil eye (Naveh and Shaked 1985 275). Normally the aram. lexeme is presented as a root *b'š (ar. *ba'isa*) but in akk. we find *bīšu* (CAD B.270, adj. 'malodorous, evil') which may appear in ug. *btylt* analysed as a derived nominative form with y, where 'bad' > 'evil'. The phrase 'n *btylt* is for del Olmo Lete a translation of the Sumerian phrase *igi hul* 'evil eye' or Akkadian *inu lemuttu* 'eye of the evil man'.

¹¹³Many scholars relate *tpnn* to the root *pn* 'turn' cf. hb. פָּנָה (e.g. *TOu2* 43 n.95, *ARTU* 110). Del Olmo Lete (1992 11) compares *tpnn* to ar. *fanna* 'to deceive, confuse', *fannana* 'to diversify, to confuse'. In his opinion, the first occurrence has 'n *bty* / 'n *btt* as the subjects of the verb, and the second occurrence (line 6) has 'n *mhr* / *phr* / *tgr* as objects of the verb.

¹¹⁴*CML2* (151) suggests "meeting" cf. akk. *maḥāru* 'to meet'. Astour (1963 7) translates "market" cf. akk. *maḥāru*. Lipinski (1965 58) compares it to akk. *maḥāru* 'to meet' and ar. *maḥara* 'to cut in two' figuratively 'to cross' and arrived at the translation "l'union", i.e. sexual union. *ARTU* (110) has "eye of a rival". Del Olmo Lete (1992 12) believes that *mhr*, *phr* and *tgr* designate the victims whose eyes are affected by the evil eye and compares *mhr* with akk. *maḥāru* translating "alcablero" [tax collector].

¹¹⁵This is often taken to mean 'assembly' and is used of the assembly of the gods, *phr ilm* (*KTU* 1.47.29, 1.148.9 and *phr m'd* in *KTU* 1.2.i.14, etc.). Lipinski (1965 58) acknowledges the translation 'gathering, assembly', but he translates "la copulation" preferring to venture a derivative of the primary meaning of the root, 'to unite', 'to glorify'. *ARTU* (110) translates "eye of a potter" and del Olmo Lete (1992 12) follows de Moor (1979 647) in seeing this as a Babylonian word 'potter', pointing out that a potter is the victim of the evil eye in the Mesopotamian text VAT 10018 (Thomsen 1992 24: although it is not the eye of the potter that is affected but his oven).

drunk.¹¹⁶ However, when we try to go beyond this simple statement, difficulties of interpretation abound. To begin with, who or what is the subject of these verbs, and what is the significance of *ah* 'brother'? There is difficulty in understanding the verb *šnwt*, but even where we are fairly clear about the translation of verbs, are we really to understand the verbs in a literal sense, or should they be understood metaphorically? What is the significance of eating flesh *without a knife*, and drinking blood *without a cup*? The answers to all these questions have a direct bearing on how we translate this text, but we are also guided in our answers by what we consider to be the meaning of the text.

The main difficulty in attempting to interpret this text is establishing the *dramatis personae*. The almost universal interpretation of this text is as a mythic episode between Anat and Baal; however, it should be noted that nowhere in the text itself are their names mentioned! The text opens with the word '*nn*' which is usually emended to '*nt*' in order to give the narrative a character already known to us from Ugaritic myth; Baal is then seen as the character *ahh* 'her brother'.

If we follow the line of enquiry which sees Anat and Baal as the main characters in this myth, we are faced with the problem of why Anat devours her brother in such a ferocious manner. Virolleaud (1961), Astour (1963 and 1988), and Pope (1977) interpret this passage as an omophagic ritual in which Anat literally devours her brother. Loewenstamm (1963), Løkkegaard (1982) and Walls (1992) also interpret the verbs literally but assume that Anat merely stumbles across the remains

¹¹⁶Statements to the effect that the metaphorical meaning of the text is readily understood, e.g. Korpel (1990 117), "clearly this is a metaphorical expression, meaning that she 'devours' him with her eyes" really glosses over the difficulties involved in understanding a complex metaphor in a little understood text.

of Baal who has been devoured by some third party.¹¹⁷ *TOu2* bases its interpretation on an assessment of the divine name ‘Anat’ meaning ‘spring, well’ and suggests that Anat does not literally eat her brother, but gathers the scattered waters of the Earth, which in the myth are collectively represented by the body of Baal.¹¹⁸

Sanmartín (1978 354) and *CML2* (32) interpret the passage as a metaphor for the sexual union between Baal and Anat, whilst Lipinski (1965 61) reads a sexual meaning into almost every line of text and believes that the text describes the impregnation of Anat by Baal, but that this was accomplished by Anat devouring Baal’s penis!

If Anat is the subject, who then is the object of the action? The text tells us that it is *ahh* ‘her brother’. The most obvious candidate who springs to mind is Baal, who is elsewhere labelled the brother of Anat.¹¹⁹ However, Baal is not the only one to whom Anat is a *aht*. Despite the difficulty in understanding the semantic range of the term *ah* || *aht* in the mythic texts,¹²⁰ Anat could in theory be called *aht* of any of the children of El, since at the very least, they are all subordinate to their ‘father’ El. A further possibility is Aqhat, who in *KTU* 1.18.i.24 is called the *ah* of Anat.¹²¹

¹¹⁷Loewenstamm is unable to determine who had eaten Baal (131 fn. 7) whilst Løkkegaard assumes *ysmm* is a misspelling for *ysmm* and suggests it was the ‘Beautiful ones’ who we find in *KTU* 1.23 who have eaten him.

¹¹⁸*TOu2* 41 “Les sources recueillent les eaux éparées sur la terre: la déesse qui personnifie les sources recueille l’eau, substance de Ba‘al, qui s’est répandue et perdue dans la terre lors de la disparition annuelle du dieu.”

¹¹⁹E.g. *KTU* 1.6.ii.12, and cf. 1.10.ii.16 where Anat is counted among the sisters (*aht*) of Baal.

¹²⁰For an appraisal of Anat’s kinship relationships in the Ugaritic pantheon, and especially on the ‘sister’ relationship, see Walls (1992 89f.). Even if we were to accept his argument for Anat having no kinship ties with the children of Athirat (p.94), by his own admission, the term *aht* could be used to describe the relationship between them if only in the sense of the equal status they share.

¹²¹An observation of Dr N. Wyatt.

What might be the motive for Anat to eat her 'brother'? Virolleaud (1961 183) raises the possibility that Baal had committed some offence which led to Anat punishing him, but proposes instead some vague mystical ritual in which it was Anat's duty to drink the blood of Baal to protect her people (185).¹²² Astour (1963 9f.) raises the possibility of hatred or vengeance but concludes,

...seulement les générations postérieures, plus rationalistes, se sentirent embarrassées par le manque apparent de motif d'un acte aussi cruel; elles tentèrent de lui en donner un, mais non sans hésitation et de nombreuses contradictions.

For Astour (1963 and 1988) the real meaning of this text is revealed by a comparison with the Bacchanalia: this is pure *theophagy*, reflecting on the mythical plane the ritual practice of dismemberment and consumption of raw flesh of a sacrificial animal that stood in place of a human victim (1988 9). However, while he attempts to demonstrate a link between Greek cultic practice and Semitic religion, Astour fails to progress beyond the simple observation that both traditions involve the ingestion of flesh. He fails to explain why Anat, in his interpretation of the text, should go from tearing Baal to pieces and eating his raw flesh, to 'window shopping' at the local market; his only comment is that any explanation is lost in the lacuna that follows.

Walls (1992 214) looks for an explanation in the observed anthropological phenomenon of *endocannibalism*. Accepting that Anat is the one who devours Baal, he suggests that there is no reason to believe Baal is alive when Anat finds him. Overcome with grief, she engages in the ritual frenzy of endocannibalism in order to assume the power of Baal into herself. However, I would point out that there is no suggestion of this sort of behaviour when Anat comes across Baal's body in the Baal

¹²²Cf. also Virolleaud (1960a 129), "... il n'y a là ni crime, ni châtement, et que la déesse Anat cherchait seulement et trouvait dans ce breuvage un surcroît de force, ou, pour parler comme le célèbre philosophe, un supplément d'âme."

cycle; Walls himself admits that there are no other examples of this sort of behaviour elsewhere in the ancient Near East, and that there does not appear to be any vocabulary in 1.96 which could be related to ritual mourning or grief. I would therefore hesitate to accept his interpretation of Anat's behaviour in this text.

We are on firmer ground when dealing with the volatile nature of Anat's personality; we only have to think of her treatment of Mot in *KTU* 1.6.ii, and her reaction on seeing Aqhat's bow in 1.17.vi. Perhaps we should understand the verb *šnw* as cognate with the Akkadian *šanû* (*CAD* Š/I) which can be an intransitive verb indicating a violent change in mood or personality. In this case, the text may describe Anat flying into a rage (of jealousy?) over the beauty of her brother and ending with the destruction of that which she envied, exactly the case in Aqhat where the bow is broken as a direct result of her attempt to take it from Aqhat.

What follows in the narrative is even more difficult to determine. The lexeme 'n seems to be particularly important, and Virolleaud (1961) and *TOu2* suggest a list of springs which the goddess turned towards or visited. This approach leaves unresolved the meaning of *bty*, *btt*, *mhr*, *pḥr*, and *tḡr*, simply accepting them as place names. Another approach (*ARTU*, del Olmo Lete 1992) is to gloss 'n as the noun 'eye' in construct with the following nouns. However, *ARTU*'s rather weak explanation of Anat metaphorically devouring Baal with her eyes followed by a list of keen-eyed people (1987 110 n.11) remains unconvincing.¹²³

Various attempts at rationalising the behaviour of Anat have depended on the assumption that 'nn in line 1 should be emended to 'nt. However, perhaps we should attempt to interpret the text as we find it; that is, accepting 'nn as the subject

¹²³Cf. also Korpel (1990 99).

of the verbs in lines 1f. One possible candidate for 'nn appears in the mythic texts¹²⁴ who are the servants of Baal (perhaps to be equated with Gupan and Ugar? *CML* 2 42). This is almost certainly to be understood as 'clouds',¹²⁵ which is entirely appropriate to the image of Baal as a storm god. The one text which appears to deviate from this pattern of 'nn as a servant of Baal is *KTU* 1.4.iv.59, in which we read,

p 'bd an 'nn atrt**
p 'bd ank ah*d ul*t*
*hm amt atr*t tln* lbnt*

This is usually taken as a question spoken by El (perhaps rather sarcastically) asking whether he is now a slave, or a servant of Athirat.¹²⁶ However, given that all the other occurrences of 'nn refer to the servants of Baal, I suggest that this passage should be taken as an example of staircase parallelism (Watson 1984 151). However, unlike Watson who translates the first line, "Am I a slave, then, Athirat's menial?", I would understand 'nn atrt as a vocative, following the example of almost all the other examples of staircase parallelism given by Watson. This is probably a case of divine 'name-calling' by El, alluding to Athirat's eagerness to plead on behalf of Baal; using the epithet 'nn as a well known pointer to the servants of Baal, El associates Athirat with them and repeats the insult in the following *amt atrt*. Therefore, I translate,

Am I a slave, then, O *servant* Athirat?

Am I a slave, then, to grasp the trowel?

Indeed let the slave-girl Athirat make bricks!

¹²⁴*KTU* 1.2.i.35; 1.3.iv.32; 1.4.iv.59, viii.15; 1.10.ii.33.

¹²⁵Cf. hb. ענן.

¹²⁶E.g. del Olmo Lete 1981 201 (note his mistake in the transliteration).

In this translation, '*nn atrt* is an allusion to the fact that Athirat's mission is on behalf of Baal. The '*nn* of Baal are thought of as plural,¹²⁷ and this would fit well with Loewenstamm's (1972) and Løkkegaard's (1982) observation that the verbs *tspi* and *tšt* could be 3 plural *yqtl*. However, these verbs could also be fem. singular, and we are still left with the verb *hlkt* which appears to be the feminine form, whereas the '*nn* usually take masculine verbs. We are also faced with the problem of who the *ah* is in relation to the servants of Baal, and why it has a singular pronominal suffix rather than a plural. It seems to me that this solution leaves too many unsolved problems.

This impasse brings us to the recent article of del Olmo Lete (1992)¹²⁸ who has cast this text in a completely fresh light. He understands the whole text to be an incantation against the effects of the evil eye, drawing on the work of Thomsen (1992) who assembles all the Mesopotamian texts which deal with the subject of the evil eye. Thomsen observes that we know of only seven incantations against the evil eye and ten other contexts which mention it, spanning the period from the end of the third millennium to the Late Babylonian period (600 B.C. to the end of the first millennium).¹²⁹ Of the incantations, five are Sumerian, one is bilingual and one Akkadian which leads Thomsen (1992 28) to conclude that the belief in the evil eye may have belonged to an earlier period of Mesopotamian history, although she admits that the absence of large numbers of rituals against the evil eye, as we find against

¹²⁷In *KTU* 1.3.iv.33, Anat uses the 2m plural personal pronoun when she addresses them, and in *KTU* 1.4.viii.17 Baal uses the 2m plural suffixed personal pronoun when addressing them (*y'dbkm*), despite the use of singular masculine verbs to describe their actions.

¹²⁸I thank Dr W.G.E. Watson for bringing this article to my attention.

¹²⁹Foster (1993 55 = I.3) presents an Old Akkadian incantation which may be against the evil eye but considered uncertain by Thomsen. Foster (1993 848 = IV.31) also gives a translation of VAT 10018.

witchcraft for example, may be explained by the perception of the evil eye as more of an irritation in everyday life rather than a life-threatening malignant force. She writes,

It [the evil eye] was simply not serious enough to demand a place among the important incantation series, which protected against demons, witchcraft, and diseases, and not important enough to require a complicated ritual to avert it.

Thomsen (1992 22) observes that the evil eye, like witchcraft and sorcery, was caused by malevolent human beings, rather than demons or gods, but whereas the latter two could result in serious illness or death, the evil eye's effects were rather more limited. From the descriptions given in Mesopotamian texts, Thomsen concludes that the evil eye produced accidents or annoying, rather than life-threatening, situations such as a process going wrong, tools breaking or clothes tearing; it could even 'seize' a man's features (cf. text 11 of Thomsen). Another effect of the eye is to cause discord between brothers or neighbours. Although the source of the eye is human, the eye itself may be portrayed as having a life of its own, pictured as an animal or a 'dragon' (Thomsen 1992 25).

It is against this background of belief in the malignant effects of the evil eye that del Olmo Lete (1992) translates this text. According to his interpretation, in the first eight lines we have a description of the wandering of the evil eye and its harmful effects. It disfigures the beauty of its 'brother', which is understood in the loose sense of 'brother' or 'neighbour' of the person who is the source of the evil eye (1992 10), a process described metaphorically in the eating of flesh and drinking of blood, and which corresponds to the Mesopotamian belief of the eye 'seizing' the features of its victim. In lines 5-6 we are told that the source of the evil eye is an 'evil man' and 'evil woman', which again corresponds neatly to the ideas contained in the Mesopotamian literature collected by Thomsen. From lines 7-11 we find a chiasmic sequence with things affected by the evil eye and, in reverse order, an appeal for its effects to be reversed, followed by the wish for the evil eye to return to its source,

perhaps to return the same malignant effects on its owner as was intended for the victim.¹³⁰

Del Olmo Lete's interpretation of this text is persuasive, and if correct, then we can no longer accept *KTU* 1.96 as evidence for the character of Anat. The idea that an evil eye is the subject of this text removes the difficulties we faced in explaining why Anat should devour her brother, since we are now dealing with a metaphor for what in Mesopotamian literature we find described as 'seizing' the features of the victim.

The list of victims in lines 7f. translated as 'rival' (*ARTU*) or 'tax collector' (del Olmo Lete 1992), 'potter' and 'gate-keeper' seems a rather heterogeneous collection, and the underlying idea that these are all professions which need a keen eye (*ARTU* 110 n.10, del Olmo Lete 1992 12) seems somewhat weak, although the Mesopotamian texts include such lists of victims with even less apparent connection between them. On the other hand, we could understand this short series as elements within the context of disputation. We know from texts such as *KTU* 1.17.v.6f. and Dt. 21.9, 22.15, 25.7, etc., that there was a tradition in the ancient Near East for legal disputes to be heard at the city gate. Perhaps the *mhr* and *p hr* refers to groups involved in the legal process, and we know that the gate-keeper could act as accuser from *KTU* 1.114.11. Perhaps there is some significance in the phonological similarity between '*n*' and *ttb* of our text and the verbs '*ny*' and *twb* which in some circumstances may have the meaning of 'accusation' and 'response to accusation', for example in I Sam. 12.3. However, this kind of association must lie at the fringes of a reader's consciousness, and is impossible to support with evidence. However we understand the series *mhr* - *p hr* - *tgr*, this does not change the fact that the analysis of

¹³⁰The wish for the evil intended for a victim to return to its source and take its effect there is seen in Akkadian incantations against witchcraft (e.g. Foster 1993 648).

del Olmo Lete is the most persuasive of all those offered for this difficult text, and is one which rules out *KTU* 1.96 as a text dealing with Anat or Baal.

4.3. TEXTS IN WHICH ANAT PLAYS A MINOR ROLE

Having looked at those texts in which Anat plays the defining role in the narrative, we now turn our attention to the larger collection of texts in which the goddess appears as a minor character in relation to other characters in the narratives.

4.3.1. *KTU* 1.22

It is argued by some scholars that texts *KTU* 1.20-22 preserve fragments of a missing fourth tablet of the Aqhat narrative (e.g. *TOu1* 463, Dijkstra and de Moor 1975, *ARTU* 224), while others believe that they form an independent narrative cycle (Dijkstra 1988) primarily concerning the Rephaim (e.g. *MLC*, Parker 1989 134f.), but which may have included an episode of Danil visiting the feast of the Rephaim to reclaim his dead son (*CML2* 27 n.2).¹³¹ The end of line *KTU* 1.21.ii.8 reads *y'n il* 'and El/the god said', and, because of the fragmentary nature of the tablets, is the only indication we have of the speaker in these texts. However, de Moor (*ARTU* 267 n.271) believes that this should either be emended to read *wy'n <dn>il* (homoioteleuton), or that Danil has been deified and is now addressed as 'god'. *TOu1* (462) believes that the speaker in *KTU* 1.21.ii.8 is El who invites the Rephaim to his house. However, *TOu1* argues that since there is no direct evidence that the other five invitations to the Rephaim are spoken by El, and since in *KTU* 1.20.ii.7-8 we find the mention of Danil paralleled with the epithets of Danil that we

¹³¹For detailed photographs and a new assessment of the text see Pitard (1992).

find in the Aqhat narrative (*dnil*[] || *ğzr.mt hrnmy* cf. *KTU* 1.17.ii.27f. *dnil mt.rpi* || *ğzr.mt hrnmy*), then these fragments belong to the Aqhat narrative, perhaps as its conclusion.

I would hesitate to link these texts with the Aqhat narrative on the basis that there is no indication of Danil as the host of the banquet, that El is indicated as issuing an invitation, and that the character of the narrative in these texts appears to be quite different to that of the Aqhat narrative (*CML2* 27 n.2, *contra* Lloyd 1990 185).¹³² However, the main interest for us is that in *KTU* 1.22.i and ii we find references to Anat, although she does not play a large role in these texts.

<i>tm</i> 5) <i>tkm. bm tkm. aqm.</i>	There, shoulder to shoulder were the brothers,
<i>qym. il</i> 6) <i>b lsmt.</i>	those who assist ¹³³ El with haste.
<i>tm. ytbš. šm. il. mtm</i>	There, the mortals affirm ¹³⁴ the name of El,
7) <i>y'bš (ytbš). brkn (ybrkn). šm. il. ġzrm</i>	the heroes (<i>y'bš</i> ¹³⁵) bless ¹³⁶ the name of El.

¹³²See the discussion of this text in Lewis (1989 86f.); he finds it hard to choose between Danil and El as the host of the banquet, but concludes that whoever it was, this text provides strong evidence for the funerary character of the *marzeah*.

¹³³De Moor takes *qym* as a D-stem of *qm* and translates "whom Ilu made stand up in haste" (*SP* 117, *ARTU* 271 n.289). *TOu1* translates "suscités par El" following Gray (1965 128) who sees in *qym* a perfect factitive verb (from *qm* 'rise up') with El as its subject. Dietrich *et al.* (1976a 49) translate "beide Feinde Els in Eile" [both enemies of El in a hurry]. *MLC* (617) takes it as a noun 'asistente' cf. aram. *qayyām*.

¹³⁴*SP* (117) believes *tbš* to be a loan word from akk. *šubšû* 'substantiate'. *TOu1* (474 n.q) takes this and its parallel *y'bš* in the next line as possibly the same verb meaning something like 'be angry'. Dietrich *et al.* (1976a 50) take this to mean 'sich zornig abwenden, zürnen' [to become angry, rage]. *MLC* (640) glosses *tbš* as 'to celebrate' || *brk* cf. ar. *šabata* 'to stand by' with metathesis. *ARTU* (272) translates "the name of Ilu gave substance to the dead". I agree with del Olmo Lete's observation that this is parallel to *brk* 'to bless' and my translation "affirm" attempts to convey the meaning of the Akkadian cognate *šubšû*.

¹³⁵Some take this as an error for *y'tbš* given the similar morphology of the two letters (*SP* 117; *TOu1* 474). *KTU* 65 and *MLC* 422 takes *y'bš.brkn* as an error with dittography for *ybrkn*, which I follow to give a more coherent parallel structure.

¹³⁶*SP* (117) takes *brkn* as an infinitive with energetic ending, or as a noun. *TOu1* (474 n.s) believes this to be parallel to *b lsmt*, in which case they divide it as the preposition *b* a root *rkn* cf. ar. *rukn* 'support'. Dietrich *et al.* (1976 50) propose a D-stem 'to curse'. *MLC* (422) takes this from the root *brk* and as an error for *ybrkn*.

8) *tm. tmq. rpu. b'l.*
mhr b'l 9) w mhr. 'nt.
*tm. yhpñ. hyl 10) hñ.*¹³⁸
zbl. mlk. 'lmy.
km. tdd 11) 'nt. šd.
tštr. 'pt. šmm
 12) *tbñ. alpm. ap šin*.*
šql. trm 13) w mri ilm.
'glm. dt. šnt
 14) *imr. qmš. llim.*

There was *Thamaqu*¹³⁷ the *Rpu* of Baal,
 warrior of Baal and warrior of Anat.
 There was *yahipānu* the fighter,
 the prince, eternal¹³⁹ king.
 Then Anat went out¹⁴⁰ to hunt,
 she took herself off¹⁴¹ (to hunt) the birds of the sky.
 They slaughtered both cattle and sheep,
 they felled bulls and the fattest of rams,
 calves of one year,
 skipping lambs and kids.¹⁴²

Commencing with line 5 we have a description of the heavenly court after which, in lines 10f. a lavish description of the banquet prepared for the Rephaim (MLC 409). In line 8 we are told that the character *Thamaqu* was present, and he is described as a Rephaite, and a warrior (*mhr*) of Baal and of Anat. This close connection between the underworld and Anat is one we have already witnessed in the Ilimilku texts, and this is reinforced by what we find in the cultic texts from Ugarit.

¹³⁷Most take this as the name of a character from the underworld (e.g. *SP* 117, *TOuI* 474 n.u, Dietrich *et al.* 1976 50, *MLC* 423). *ARTU* (272) however takes it as a verb and translates "there rose up Ba'lu the Saviour". I think the prosodic division of the text by del Olmo Lete makes good sense of the text, and this places *tmq* in parallel with *yhpñ*, which are both taken as personal names.

¹³⁸*SP* (117) reads *hñ* 'filth' rather than *y*. *TOuI* (475 n.w) also reads *hñ* as *y* 'O!' cf. ar. *yā*. *MLC* (423) takes it as the final *y* in *hyly*, a masc. adjective. Examination of a colour slide of the text reveals that with the *hyl* of the previous line, the final *l* protrudes onto the column divider leaving absolutely no room for any other characters after. Also, the morphology of the first grapheme of line 10 is very similar to other examples of *y* in the text, and there can be no morphological protest against taking this as *y*.

¹³⁹*SP* (117) divides 'lmy as 'll 'child' and *my* or *mn* giving 'child of whom?' as a derisive designation of a usurper (cf. *ARTU* 272). *TOuI* (475 n.y) separates the preposition 'l from *lmy* but is unable to give a translation for *lmy*, although it suggests that we could read *mlk* 'lmy 'my eternal kingdom' with the doubled *l* as dittography. *MLC* (600) takes 'lmy as a masculine adjective 'eternal' from 'lm.

¹⁴⁰Cf. hb. 𐤊𐤕 'retreat, flee, depart'.

¹⁴¹*TOuI* (475 n.a) 3fs imperfect Š-stem of *tr* 'to turn'. As a parallel to *tdd* we could take *tštr* as a 3fs Gt-stem imperfect of the root *šr* cf. hb. 𐤍𐤕 I. 'travel, journey', akk. *šāru*, ar. *sāra*.

¹⁴²Cf. Lloyd (1990 172).

The fact that *Thamaqu* is a *mhr* of Anat indicates that the term *mhr* 'warrior' could indicate a soldier who fought on behalf of, or under the command of, Anat rather than opposed to her as we find in 1.3.ii.¹⁴³

After the description of the parties present, the narrative turns to a formulaic description of the preparations for the banquet that took place (Lloyd 1990). However, before this we find a bicolon describing Anat apparently going off to hunt (*šd*). A difficulty in understanding this bicolon lies in the relationship of the verb to the nominal phrase in the second colon since there is no preposition to guide us. We know from other texts that Anat had the capacity to fly, and is even described as winged; in 1.10.ii.10f. Anat lifts up her wings and takes to the skies in search of Baal, and in 1.18.iv.31f. we find Anat hovering above her prey among the eagles. In this case we could understand the second half of this bicolon as "she took herself off (with/among) the birds of heaven". However, we might expect a preposition such as *b(n)* 'among, with' as we find in 1.18.iv.21. The alternative is to take the verb *šd* as semantically paralleled in the second half of the bicolon, even though graphically it is not, in which case we see Anat going out to hunt the 'birds of heaven'. The fact that we have the verb *šd* 'hunt' does not necessarily mean that she went on a journey far from the area of the banquet as we find Baal doing in text 1.10.¹⁴⁴ We can see from the parallel use of *dbḥ* || *šd* in text *KTU* 1.114.1f.¹⁴⁵ that the verb *šd* can be used to indicate action involved in preparation for a banquet, in parallel with *dbḥ* 'slaughter', in which case perhaps here in text 1.22 we find Anat involved in the preparations for

¹⁴³We are probably to restore [*mhr*] 'nt at the end of line 7-8 of 1.22.ii, on the basis that at the beginning of line 7 we find *mhr b'l**.

¹⁴⁴The fact that he has taken his bow and arrows (1.10.ii.6-7) indicates that Baal is out hunting; cf. the remark of Aqhat (1.17.vi.40) to Anat who disputes that women should use the bow to hunt with (*šd*).

¹⁴⁵Lewis (1989 83f.) notes the similarities between text 1.22 and 1.114.

the feast. The fact that she hunts ‘birds of heaven’ (*pt šmm*) is reminiscent of text 1.23 in which El captures a bird out of the sky (*yr bšmm* ‘*sr*’ line 38) as part of a love charm. However, there is no indication that this is what Anat is trying to achieve here in text 1.22, and I would prefer to relate her actions to the fact that in some cultic texts we find that birds (*ynt qrt*) are offered to various deities,¹⁴⁶ and since the heavenly banquet is a mythic reflection of cultic offerings, the killing of birds for the feast would not be incongruous.

4.3.2. *KTU* 1.82

Text 1.82 (RS 15.134) presents many difficulties of interpretation and this has resulted in surprisingly few attempts at a comprehensive translation of the text. The text itself appears to be divided into ‘paragraphs’ by horizontal lines drawn across the tablet. The first detailed attempt at translation was undertaken by van Zijl (1972, 1974 and 1975), but over the course of three articles he covered only the first seven lines. De Moor and Spronk (1984) have presented a translation of the whole text and interpreted it as a series of incantations, but the meanings they give to many of the lexemes are open to question, and the large amount of reconstruction necessary to make sense of the damaged text only serves to highlight the difficulties of interpretation faced by translators. Caquot (1988) emphasises the uncertainties that hinder our understanding of the text, pointing out that unlike text 1.100 whose paragraphs appear as a progression within a coherent context, it is impossible to see any logical progression from one paragraph to the next in text 1.82, and even an internal coherence for each paragraph is not obvious. *TOu2* (62) suggests that the paragraphs are magical incantations to drive away malignant spirits and that the very

¹⁴⁶A possible instance of Anat being offered a ‘town-pigeon’ (*ynt qrt*) is seen in *KTU* 1.41.9f. || 1.87.

first paragraph of this text is a mythic precedent illustrating the valour of Baal, and thus imbuing the individual spells with similar authority and power.¹⁴⁷

We find Anat in the second paragraph of this text which runs from line 8 to line 14 of the recto. The translations offered by de Moor and Spronk on the one hand and Caquot on the other, are quite different in their approach, and the translation we give is presented with great hesitancy, acknowledging the uncertainties inherent in this text. After a short introduction which may involve the offering of tributes (Caquot 1988, *Tou2*), we find a reference to the speaker's mother (*um*) who may be attacking the father (*aby* with 1s pronominal suffix). Following this in line 10f. we find the following,

10) ... *yrk. b'l.[]*

11) []x 'nt. *hzm.*

tštšh. km. hb[]

De Moor and Spronk (1984) translate as follows,

May Ba'lu bind¹⁴⁸ [my mother],¹⁴⁹

[May] Anatu [fast]en¹⁵⁰ (her) with a rope,¹⁵¹

Let her be bowed down¹⁵² like someone trus[sed up]¹⁵³

¹⁴⁷Cf. the use of mythic precedents and other similar techniques in pLeiden I.343+345 (Massart 1954). Also compare the actions of *š'tqt* who strikes Keret's illness with a mace (*ht*) so that death (*mt*) is defeated (*ht*) (*MLC* 554); akk. *hatû* A. 'smite' is a verb used to describe the actions of diseases, but also used of gods and divine weapons (*CAD* 6.151f.).

¹⁴⁸They derive this verb from a root **rky* cf. ar. *rkw* 'to bind', and see in this an appeal for Baal to bind the ghost of the mother who is causing the problem and against whom this incantation is addressed.

¹⁴⁹Restoring [*umy*].

¹⁵⁰Restoring [*t't*]k. They point to the use of the verb 'tk with Anat, cf. *KTU* 1.3.ii.11, 1.13.7.

¹⁵¹De Moor and Spronk (1984 242) read *šzm* following the *editio princeps* of Virolleaud, and translate 'rope' cf. ar. *ḥabl mašzūr* 'twisted rope', with enclitic *-m*. Caquot (1988 38) verbal noun with adverbial *-m* of *hzm* cf. hb. and aram. 'return' or 'repeat'.

Compare this with the translation of *TOu2*,

Que Ba'al *tire*¹⁵⁴ sur toi [...] (11) [...] Que 'Anat en *revenant*¹⁵⁵ *prépare*
*une fosse*¹⁵⁶ comme — — — [...]

There seems to be merits with both translations at different points and it is hard to know how to choose between them, or whether we should gloss any of the words in an entirely different manner. De Moor and Spronk's attempt has the advantage of including *h₂zrm* and attempting to translate *km.hb[]* in a way that is coherent with the rest of their translation. However, I am attracted by Caquot's division of *tštšh* into two lexemes, *tšt* a 3fs imperfect of *št* 'put, place' and *šh* which he explains by way of hb. שְׁחָה 'pit', but also compare hb. שְׁחָה 'pit' which is a device for trapping dangerous animals such as lions, but also was used as a parallel to the underworld (שְׁחָה). The phrase *km.hb[]* which Caquot could not translate, may perhaps be restored *km.h[dr(h)]*¹⁵⁷ with *h₂dr* glossed as 'chamber, enclosure', cf. hb. חֲדָר 'chamber, room'. This would give the following translation,

¹⁵²Jussive 3fs Št-stem of *šhy* 'to be made bow down'.

¹⁵³Restoring *hb[l]* 'rope'.

¹⁵⁴Cf. hb. יָרָה 'throw, shoot', with 2s pronominal suffix.

¹⁵⁵Caquot (1988 38) explains *h₂zrm* as a verbal noun with adverbial *-m* from a root *h₂zr* cf. aram. 'to come back', but *TOu2* (66 n.187) says that it leaves this word untranslated, even though its translation seems to follow that of Caquot (1988).

¹⁵⁶Caquot (1988 38) divides the text *tšt šh*. He explains *šh* by hb. שְׁחָה 'pit' and *tšt* as 3fs imperfect 'to place' with Anat as subject, and this invocation to Anat makes reference to her talents as a huntress.

¹⁵⁷This assumes that the final vertical wedge of the *d* has been lost in the lacuna, but without access to a photograph of the text it is impossible to judge the veracity of this judgement.

May Baal bind [my mother (?)]

May Anat [secure her] with a rope,

May she prepare a pit as [her chamber].

This translation sees the third colon as a progression from the preceding two cola; after the spirit of the mother has been tied up and secured by Baal and Anat, the hope is that the ghost will be thrown into a pit as its final resting place.

Whether or not we accept this translation, we can be fairly confident that the text describes a joint action performed by Baal and Anat, whatever that might be. This close co-operation between these two is something we find in the Baal cycle, and also in texts *KTU* 1.10 and 1.13 (whatever our interpretation of these texts). The imagery of Baal and Anat binding the ghost may be due to the fact that both are portrayed as prestigious hunters, and we might say that this text calls on them to ‘hunt’ the malignant spirit and to capture it using established hunting skills, in order to bind it and be rid of it for good. The possible reference to a pit with its connotations of the underworld, and the call for Anat to put the spirit into the pit, may draw on the same imagery we find illustrated in the cultic texts and the Ilimilku texts, such as we find in *KTU* 1.6.i where Anat puts Baal’s body into a hole (*hrt*).

4.3.3. *KTU* 1.100 and 1.107

Text 1.100 (RS 24.244), found in the excavations of the *Cella aux Tablettes* in 1961 (*TEOI*), is one of the best preserved texts to come from Ugarit and has had many studies devoted to its elucidation; some of the more recent include Bowman and Coote (1980), Dietrich and Loretz (1980a), Xella (1981), Kottsieper (1984), de Moor (1988), Pardee (1988) and Caquot (*TOu2*). Text 1.100 has many affinities with the poorly preserved *KTU* 1.107 (RS 24.251+) and the two are discussed together; both appear to be concerned with the poison of a snake (*hmt*),

both involve the god Ḥoron (*hrn*) and the goddess Shapshu, both include a series of deities which are remarkably similar. However, unlike 1.100 in which Shapshu plays the role of an intermediary, in 1.107 she appears to take a direct involvement in the healing of the afflicted *šrgzz*.

In 1.100 we find a number of sections ruled off on the tablet by horizontal lines. After an initial introduction to the character called 'the Mare' (*phlt*),¹⁵⁸ we find her calling to her mother (*um*) Shapshu to take her message to various deities, the first one being El. After this we find nine paragraphs, identical almost word for word, except for the deities and their residences to whom Shapshu is supposed to take her message, following which the narrative changes with an address to Ḥoron whose behaviour differs from that of all the previous deities.

In the fourth paragraph (line 20) the message is taken by Shapshu to Anat and Athtart at *inbb*, which indicates that this location was the mythical residence of these two goddesses. The sequence of deities in which they appear is as follows:

El, Baal, Dagan, Anat and Athtart, Yarikh, Reshef, Athtart, *zz w kmt, mlk*, Kothar and Khasis, Shaḥar and Shalim, Ḥoron.

Compare this list to those we find in text 1.107:

E[l] and Ḥoron, [Baal] and Dagan, Anat and Athtart, Yarikh and Reshef, [Athta]r and *'tpr, zz w ktt, mlk*, [Koth]ar and Khasis, Shaḥar and Shalim.

¹⁵⁸This character is called the mother of the 'stallion' (*phl*) and this lexeme is found in Ugaritic texts 1.4.iv (= the animal on which Athirat rides) and in 1.19.ii (= the animal on which Danil rides), cf. akk. *puḫālu*, ar. *fahlu*. Presumably, *phlt*, who is the mother (*um*) of *phl*, is the feminine form of this noun.

As we can see, there are slight differences between these two sequences, notably Athtar and *'tpr*¹⁵⁹ in 1.107 rather than Athtart of Mari (Pardee 1988 211) in 1.100. Neither sequence appears to be correlated to the sequences of deities we find in the cultic texts which include Anat (see my chapter on cultic texts). In 1.107 we find pairs of deities some of which are known from elsewhere, but others appear to be paired because of their proximity within the sequence. Text 1.100 appears to use paired deities which are known from elsewhere, and the fact that Anat and Athtart are paired in 1.100 as well as 1.107 reflects what we already know from Ugaritic mythic texts and Egyptian evidence, although this pairing is never found in the cultic texts. These texts reveal little about the character of Anat beyond the fact that she appears in a list of the most prominent deities of Ugarit, and that she is paired with Athtart. In these two texts her actions are identical to the other deities who fail to take the initiative in the matter of curing the snake bite.

4.3.4. *KTU 1.101*

KTU 1.101 (RS 24.245) measures 8.3 x 14.6 cm. and appears to be the upper left hand corner of a larger tablet, which results in the fact that the text of the recto and that of the verso is separated by a large lacuna and the relationship between the two fragments of text is uncertain; they may even be two entirely different texts (*TOu2* 45). It is estimated that the remaining part of the tablet represents almost the whole width of the original but only a third of its length (Pardee 1988 119). Each line of text is separated by a horizontal line dragged across the tablet.

The recto of this tablet is a description of Baal, seated on his mountain Saphon pictured as the lord of the storm, using imagery unknown to us from any

¹⁵⁹Cf. *KTU 1.123.10*, and the variant *'ttr w 'tpr* in *KTU 1.46.4*.

other text, although text 1.10.iii pictures Baal going up to his mountain. Various suggestions for this scene include Baal's enthronement after his defeat of Yam (Fisher and Knutson 1969), Baal's Autumnal return from the underworld (*ARTU* 1f.), or a sacred marriage between Baal and Anat (Clifford 1972 78). However, the narrative context remains obscure and the relationship between the scene on the recto and that of the verso, which appears to be an abbreviated or condensed version of the events seen in *KTU* 1.3.ii-iii, is difficult to establish with any degree of certainty.

13) []s*kt. n'mn. nbl[]	... gracious one ...
14) []y*sq šmn. šlm. b š*'*	... pours oil of heaven into a bowl.
[trḥš] 15) ydh. bilt. 'nt.	[she washes] her hands the Maiden Anat,
uṣb'th*[. ybmt] 16) limm	her fingers the ybmt limm.
tiḥd. knr. ¹⁶⁰ b ydh*	She takes her lyre in her hand,
[. tšt] 17) rimt. l irth.	[she puts] (her) zither ¹⁶¹ (?) to her breast.
tšr. dd al[iyn] 18) b'l.	She sings of love of Aliyan Baal,
ahbt	of love (?)

Ignoring the lacunae, we can see from the following comparison that there is exact agreement between 1.101.14-16 and 1.3.ii.31-33.

<i>KTU</i> 1.101.14-16	<i>KTU</i> 1.3.ii.31-33
14) []y*sq šmn. šlm. b š*'*	31) ... ysq. šmn 32) šlm. b š'.
[trḥš] 15) ydh. bilt. 'nt.	trḥš. ydh. bt 33) [l]t. 'nt.
uṣb'th*[. ybmt] 16) limm	uṣb'th. ybmt. limm.

However, the comparison between 1.101.16-18 and 1.3.iii.4-7 given below reveals that there some minor differences between the two texts. On the basis of 1.101.16 we might perhaps restore *tiḥd knr bydh* in the lacuna before line 3 of text 1.3.iii. Text 1.101 has *tšr dd* for 1.3.iii's *mšr l dd* and *ahbt* where we expect *yd* from text 1.3.iii.

¹⁶⁰*KTU* reads *knr.b*, but from the photograph published in Pardee (1988) the final *h* is obviously visible.

¹⁶¹Cf. *MLC* (183), Walls (1992 120) '*rimt*-instrument', based on its parallelism with *knr*. The alternative 'corals' (e.g. *CML* 2 48) cf. hb. רַמַּתָּ ar. *ra'matu* 'sea-shell' is possible, but gives a less satisfactory solution to the poetic parallelism at this point.

KTU 1.101.16-18

*tiḥd. knr. b ydh**

[. *tšt*] 17) *rimt. l irth.*

tšr. dd al[iyn] 18) *b'l.*

ahbt

KTU 1.3.iii.4-7

4) [] *š*t* rimt* 5) *l irth.*

mšr. l. dd. aliyn (6) *b'l.*

yd. pdry. bt. ar

7) *ahbt tly. bt. rb*

Examination of a colour slide of text 1.3.iii confirms the reading *mšr*, and the difference might be due to a number of factors, including a grammatical change from D-stem participial form (note that this would be masculine singular) to 3fs imperfect which fits better with the other verbs in this section. The final *ahbt* of 1.101 may have been intended as the equivalent of line 7 in 1.3.iii, in which case a whole colon has been missed out, or simply as a synonym for *yd* that we find in 1.3.iii.6. Whatever our solution to this last problem, it appears that the scribe has prematurely finished his text in the middle of a bi/tricolon. The photograph in Pardee (1988 122) clearly shows that this is not a question of lack of space on the face of the tablet since there appears to be room for at least two more lines of text to the bottom of the column, and *ahbt* itself ends the line less than halfway across the tablet.

The relationship between the recto and verso of this tablet is unclear. As I stated above, there is the possibility that they represent two unconnected texts, but if we follow the lead of the verso which appears to be an alternative or condensed version of KTU 1.3.ii-iii, we could perhaps see in the text of the recto an alternative version of KTU 1.3.i, which happens to be a description of Baal being served at a banquet and being extolled in song. There is a lot of text missing from text 1.3.i and the beginning of text 1.3.ii, and the recto of 1.101 may represent text that is missing from the Baal cycle; for example, there may have been a description of Baal seated in splendour on Saphon before we get to the events of 1.3.i as we find it now. Thus ARTU's positioning of 1.101 recto before 1.3.i may be correct, although I disagree with his interpretations of these texts.

4.3.5. KTU 1.108

Text 1.108 (RS 24.252) measures 14.2 x 16.6 cm. and is broken at the bottom (see photo in Pardee 1988 77). The lines of text are separated by horizontal lines dragged across the face of the tablet. Because of the large lacuna, like 1.101 it is uncertain what relationship the text of the verso has to the recto, although Pardee sees a link between the two fragments seen in the key word *rpu(m)* and the play on the form *dmr* which means 'make music' on the recto but 'protection, strength' on the verso.

The text begins with a call for the deity Rapiu to drink,¹⁶²

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) []n* ¹⁶³ . yšt. rpu. mlk. 'lm. | Behold! ¹⁶⁴ may Rapiu the Eternal King ¹⁶⁵ drink, |
| w yšt 2) [il]g*tr. w yqr. | and may the god strong ¹⁶⁶ and noble drink. |
| il. ytb. b ¹⁶⁷ 'ttrt | The god enthroned at Athtartu, ¹⁶⁸ |
| 3) il* ¹⁶⁹ tpz ¹⁷⁰ . b hd r'y. | the god judging at Hidrayu. |

¹⁶²See my discussion of these lines in the chapter on Ugaritic cultic texts under KTU 1.43.

¹⁶³Pardee (1988 76) states all three wedges of the *n* are visible, and this is confirmed by examination of a colour slide of the tablet.

¹⁶⁴Reading [hl]n, Dietrich and Loretz (1980 175), Pardee (1988 83).

¹⁶⁵For a discussion of this epithet see Cooper (1987).

¹⁶⁶I accept *gtr* and *yqr* as adjectives modifying the noun *il* 'god', as a parallelism for the preceding colon where *mlk* 'lm modifies the name of the god, Rapiu. For *gtr* see Virolleaud (1968 555) who compared it to akk. *gašru* 'strong' (CAD G.56 where it is often used of gods). Margulis (1970 293) states that *gtr* must be a beverage since in line 4 Anat drinks *gtr*, and he is followed by Caquot (1976 299), cf. Syriac *gétrâ* 'sediment (of wine)', although their prosodic division raises problems. Pardee (1988 93) argues that the words *gtr* and *yqr* were chosen because of their similarity with the proper names of the god *gtr* chief of the *gtrm* and *yqr* the first of the divinised kings, and that this was a scholarly use of these words.


¹⁶⁷The light vertical wedge which separates the *b* from the ' and the horizontal wedge over the ' is explained by Pardee (1988 77f.) as a word divider added by a later editor by mistake, and who then realised his mistake and 'crossed it out' by the horizontal wedge.

¹⁶⁸Following the analysis of Margulis (1970 294), Dietrich and Loretz (1980 176), Pardee (1988 94), rather than translating 'ttrt and hdr'y as the divine names 'Athtart' and 'Hadd the Shepherd', e.g. Parker (1970 243), Ferrara and Parker (1972). Pardee (1988 94) points out that the verb *ytb* is never used with the preposition *b* meaning 'to sit with / next to someone'.

After a description of music making we then find the goddess Anat introduced,

- | | |
|---|---|
| 6) w tšt. 'nt. gtr (gtrt). | And may Anat of Gatharu ¹⁷¹ drink, |
| b'lt. mlk. | Mistress of kingship, |
| b' 7) lt. drkt. | Mistress of dominion, |
| b'lt. šmm. rmm | Mistress of the high heavens, |
| 8) [b']l*t. ¹⁷² kpt. | Mistress of the kpt-headress. ¹⁷³ |
| w 'nt. di (diy). dit. | And may winged Anat fly, |
| rhpt 9) [b šm]m* ¹⁷⁴ rm (rmm). | who soars in the high heavens, |

¹⁶⁹Pardee (1988 78) believes the asterisk of KTU is superfluous since all three wedges of the sign *l* are visible, and this could be no other sign, and my examination of a colour slide of this text confirms his opinion.

¹⁷⁰Pardee (1988 78) reads *t* rather than *z*. Examination of a colour slide at this point seems to show a grapheme constructed with an initial horizontal wedge followed by another horizontal but facing the opposite way, similar to a *q*, and underneath this second wedge is a third one facing the same direction giving the following shape: . This morphology is not clear cut, but is suggestive of a *t* than a *z*.

¹⁷¹The phrase 'nt gtr has given great difficulty to many translators. Virolleaud (1968 555) and KTU emends the text to read gtrt, i.e. making it a feminine form as an epithet of Anat. I discuss this phrase in my chapter on Ugaritic cultic texts under KTU 1.43, and conclude that the form gtr is correct, tentatively suggesting that this is a reference to Anat's relationship to the deity Gatharu witnessed in the cultic texts. However, the alternative 'Anat of the Strong One' is equally possible.

¹⁷²Pardee (1988 79) believes that the small mark before the *t* at the beginning of this line is the end of a horizontal wedge and therefore rules out KTU's *l*. Pardee tentatively suggests reading 'nt, but from the photograph we can see that there is enough room to restore [b']l and the small mark before the *t* is so small that it could be the top edge of the final vertical wedge of a *l* and not a horizontal wedge as Pardee suggests.

¹⁷³Virolleaud (1968 555) argues that šmm rmm || kpt is an antithesis, 'high heavens' || 'earth' cf. hb. kpš, akk. kapašu 'the earth which is trampled underfoot'. De Moor (1969 178) suggests "turban" cf. akk. kubšu, but Caquot (1976 300), following de Moor's etymology, believes this designates the crest of a bird seeing in this a reference to Anat's avian character. Cf. CAD K.485 where kubšu is glossed 'headress, cap' which can be part of royal insignia, or part of a divine headress.

¹⁷⁴Virolleaud (1968 555) suggests [l' š]rm. Caquot (1976 301) believes he can see on the cast the heads of two vertical wedges which could be a *b* or *š*. He restores [btk' š]rm, 'among the birds'. Pardee (1988 79) states that after the lacuna at the beginning of line 9 we can see part of a horizontal wedge followed by a vertical wedge and thus confirms KTU's reading. This can be seen in the photograph on page 77.

aklt. 'gl 'l.¹⁷⁵
m.¹⁷⁶ št

who devoured the heifer of El,
who departs¹⁷⁷ (?) ...

This text introduces us to previously unknown epithets of Anat. My translation 'Anat of Gatharu' in line 6 is uncertain (see my arguments under text 1.43) but reflects the situation we find in cultic texts where Anat seems to have some relationship with the deity Gatharu. The following four titles seem to attribute royal terminology to Anat; she is mistress of kingship, dominion, of the high heavens and of the *kpt*-headdress. Anat's titles here reflect those she receives in Egypt; for example, on the statuary group of Anat and Ramesses II (seated) she is called, 'Anat, Mistress of Heaven, Lady of the gods of Ramesses', on the group of them standing she is called 'Mistress of the Heavens', on the Brooklyn Museum relief 54.67 she is called 'Mistress of Heaven', on the BM stele 646/191 she is called 'Anat, Mistress of Heaven, Mistress of all the gods', and on the stele from Beth Shan she is 'Anat, the Queen of Heaven, Mistress of all the gods'. If we had no further evidence, we could argue that this was simply Egyptian hyperbole and that it had no bearing on Anat's position in Ugaritic myth, but with text 1.108 we see that Anat's position could be thought of as one of great authority within the pantheon, although how this related to other deities within the pantheon is not clear (Walls 1992 110).

The reference to her as 'winged' is familiar to us from texts such as 1.10 and 1.18.iv, both of which describe Anat flying, although this does not indicate she

¹⁷⁵Virolleaud (1968) shows an encircled *ayin*. De Moor (1969 178) reads the encircled ' and an aleph, thus 'gl 'l. Pardee (1988 79) states that this is clearly a *t* rather than ' that is encircled. Another example of a *t* encircled in this way is found in RS 17.67.5 where it appears to highlight an orthographic error (*tz* for *zz*) and this suggests that we have a highlighted scribal error here as well. Also compare the 'gl *il* we find in *KTU* 1.3.iii.44 which is a creature destroyed by Anat.

¹⁷⁶Pardee (1988 79) states there is no word divider at this position on the tablet. This is supported by examination of the published photograph (p.77).

¹⁷⁷De Moor (1969 178) *mšt* fem. participle of *mwš* 'to depart, move away' cf. hb. *mwš*.

took the form of a bird, simply that she had wings (for iconographical evidence for goddesses with wings see Yon [1992 292] on stele RS 2.038 which portrays an unidentified goddess with wings, and the ivory panel from Ugarit, similarly of uncertain identity).

4.3.6. *KTU 1.114*

The final tablet in this section (RS 24.258) describes a mythic feast presided over by El, ending with a rubric for the relief of a hangover; we know this ends the text since there is large space on the verso (see photo in Pardee 1988 16). After the introduction which sees El inviting the gods to banquet in his house, and the consumption of vast quantities of food and drink, we find the spectacle of Yarikh going about under the tables like a dog (*contra* de Moor 1969 167) to various deities who either give him food or blows with a stick depending on whether they know him or not. Finally we are told that he arrives at the goddesses Athtart and Anat.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 9) <i>'ttrt. w 'nt. ymgy</i> | At Athtart and Anat he arrived. ¹⁷⁸ |
| 10) <i>'ttrt. t'db. nšb lh</i> | Athtart throws ¹⁷⁹ him a haunch, ¹⁸⁰ |
| 11) <i>w 'nt. ktp</i> (Rasur <i>h?/x</i>) | and Anat a shoulder. |
| <i>bhm. yg'r. tgr 12) bt. il.</i> | The door-keeper of El's house scolds them: ¹⁸¹ |

¹⁷⁸Accepting *ymgy* as a 3ms imperfect with Yarikh as the subject (e.g. Rainey 1974 186), rather than with Athtart and Anat as the subject which leads de Moor (1969 171) to attribute a bisexual nature to these two goddesses.

¹⁷⁹Cathcart and Watson (1980 42) cf. hb. *נָזַף* 'leave' > 'throw', rather than *'db* 'prepare food' e.g. *TOu2* 74 n.225.

¹⁸⁰We accept that *nšb* is a cut of meat on the basis of its parallelism with *ktp* 'shoulder' and its occurrence in a list of meats in *KTU* 4.247.18, although no satisfactory etymology has yet been provided (e.g. de Moor 1969 171).

¹⁸¹Compare *KTU* 1.2.i.24, *bhm yg'r b'l* 'Baal scolded them' with an identical syntax and use of the preposition *b* to mark the object, *contra* Margalit (1979-80 90f.).

*pn (hn). lm. rlb¹⁸² (klb). t'dbn 13) nš*b. Look! To the dog you have thrown¹⁸³ a haunch,
l inr. t'dbn. ktp to the hound¹⁸⁴ you have thrown a shoulder*

This difficult text has been variously classified as a 'Trinkburleske' (Loewenstamm 1969), a 'farce' (Margulis 1970a), a 'ritual banquet' (Cathcart and Watson 1980), and even a narrative to "vent the poet's disdain" for El and his family (de Moor 1990 80). There appears to be some comic touches to this narrative, such as Yarikh's behaviour like a dog under the tables¹⁸⁵ and El's behaviour on seeing *hby*, where the effects of the alcohol he has consumed have a humiliating effect. Yarikh eventually arrives at the goddesses Attart and Anat who throw him choice pieces of meat from the table. Their behaviour is noteworthy since it leads to a rebuke from El's door-keeper contrasting with the behaviour of the other deities visited by Yarikh which prompts no comment from the door-keeper. Is it because they give Yarikh *nšb* || *ktp*, i.e. joints of meat, rather than *lhm* (scraps?) like the other deities?

We might ask what is the relationship between these two goddesses and Yarikh, and why is he treated differently by them? It may be the case that Yarikh receives favourable attention from Attart and Anat on account of their association with hunting, coupled to the fact that dogs were used in the hunt (Pardee 1988 48,

¹⁸²Accepting the reading of *KTU* and Pardee (1988 17), rather than *lmgrlb* (Vroilleaud 1968, de Moor 1969); note the similarity of shape between the word divider and the grapheme *g*.

¹⁸³Either 3rd imperfect so that the gate-keeper is addressing Attart and Anat as a pair, or singular enclitic forms (Rainey 1974 186).

¹⁸⁴The etymology of *inr* is difficult, but its parallelism with *klb* 'dog' (e.g. 1.16.i.15f.) renders its translation 'hound, cur' fairly certain. See e.g. Cathcart and Watson (1980 38f.), Pardee (1988 53f.) for a discussion of its etymology.

¹⁸⁵The interpretation which takes Yarikh under the tables like a dog makes better sense of the narrative than one which sees him as serving out meat to the gods whom he knew, and hitting those he did not know with a stick under the table (e.g. de Moor 1969). It is not certain whether Yarikh takes the form of a dog, or simply acts like a dog. Use of the preposition *km* indicates a simile rather than an actual metamorphosis. In this case, Bowman's (1978 136) rejection of this interpretation on the grounds that Yarikh has nothing to do with dogs misses the point.

and 74 fig. 7). In fact these two goddesses are seen going off to hunt later in this text (lines 22f.) probably to collect materials to effect a cure for El's condition, similar to the journey of Ḥoron in 1.100 for a cure for snake-bite, rather than to replenish El's table because any pangs of guilt they may have felt for having fed Yarikh with choice pieces of meat. Another possibility for this affinity between Athtart, Anat and Yarikh is seen in the cultic texts where Anat, in her relationship with Gatharu, is linked to the 'strong ones' Shapshu and Yarikh (see my discussion on *KTU* 1.43). Although in the cultic texts it is Anat who has this relationship. Perhaps in 1.114 we find the pairing of Anat and Athtart in conjunction with Anat's affinity with Yarikh?

The pairing of the goddesses in the form '*ttrt w 'nt*, and the paralleling of Athtart with Anat as the B word, reverses the more usual sequence of Anat followed by Athtart that we find elsewhere, for example in lines 22f. of this text; compare '*nt w 'ttrt* in texts 1.100 and 1.107 and '*nt || 'ttrt* in 1.114.22f. as well as 1.14.iii.41f. and possibly 1.2.i.40f. This latter sequence of Anat followed by Athirat is also echoed in Egyptian material; for example on the Rhind ostrakon, pBeatty I, and the Harris Magical papyrus we find the pair Anat and Astarte (i.e. the Egyptian equivalent of ug. Athirat).

In the damaged section of the text in lines 22f. we see these two goddesses embark on a hunt (*ṣd*), an action that we see elsewhere in mythic texts such as 1.22.10f. and 1.17.vi.40 where it is obvious from Aqhat's jibe that Anat is considered to be a huntress (Day 1992). The reason for their hunt is lost in the lacuna, but it seems reasonable to believe that they go in search of a cure for the drunken El, in much the same way as Ḥoron goes off to find a cure for the snake-bite in text 1.100.

4.4. CONCLUSIONS

Our examination of the above texts has focused our attention on many aspects of Anat's character. Some of the less significant attributes that have emerged include a further attestation of her residence being called *inbb* (cf. *KTU* 1.3.iv.34, 1.13.9), in text 1.100.20 which provides us with a list of 'official' residences for many of the more important deities worshipped at Ugarit. We also find supporting evidence for the kinship bonds given in the Ilmilku text; in 1.13.21 we find that El is called her father (*ab*), as we find in *KTU* 1.3.v.10 and perhaps restored at the end of line i.3.iv.54 [*aby*], and in *KTU* 1.10.ii.16 she is described as 'the most beautiful of Baal's sisters'.

These texts also confirm the fact that Anat was able to fly. This is seen in 1.10.ii.10f. where she lifts her wings (*knp*) and goes in search of Baal, in 1.13.8 where she flies up to her mountain *inbb* among the hawks, and 1.108.8f. where she is depicted as winged, soaring in the high heavens. This is familiar to us from the Aqhat narrative where Anat hovers over Aqhat and throws Yatpan at him in order to kill him and obtain the bow (1.18.iv). However, what is not certain is whether Anat physically changed her shape into that of a bird (a *nšr*) as Kapelrud argues (1969 106) or whether she just had wings and flew *like* a bird. In my discussion of Egyptian Anat and associated iconography we examined several pieces that portrayed goddesses with wings, for example the ivory panel from Ugarit, the bronze axe-head from Al-Biqâ, the 'Anat' stele RS 2.[038], cylinder seal RS 5.089, etc. I concluded that we could not make a positive identification of a goddess solely on the basis of an image with a pair (or two pairs) of wings, but what we do see from this is the iconographic tradition of depicting deities with wings who are otherwise anthropomorphic, sometimes with horns as well. Anat is only one of several divine figures at Ugarit who are said to fly (see my conclusion to the 'Anat' stele RS 2.[038]), and given the

iconography that depicts deities with wings that we have seen, it is unnecessary to insist that when a mythic text mentions that Anat flew, or was winged, we are to understand it to mean that she had assumed an avian form. Her ability to fly might make her a good huntress of birds (1.22.10f.), although in text 1.23 we see that El could also hunt birds.

These texts also show us that Anat was considered a formidable warrior. After Baal greets Anat on her arrival in 1.10.ii.24f., he anoints her horn (*qrm*) which is very likely to be a symbol of her aggressive power, and then calls on her to join him in an assault on his enemies which is a reminder that Anat, as well as Baal, could successfully defeat the enemies of Baal in the form of Yam and mythic monsters (1.3.iii). Even more clearly we see Anat slaughtering in 1.13.3f. in a passage very similar to 1.3.ii which includes a call for the severing of hands and heads, but in 1.13 it appears to be a prelude to her giving birth to a son for Baal whereas there seems little in the text following 1.3.ii to suggest that Anat gives birth to Baal's offspring. In 1.22.8 we find that *Thamaqu* is called a warrior (*mhr*) both of Baal and of Anat, and this not only reinforces our idea of Anat as a warrior goddess, but also her close relationship with Baal who could also be seen to act as a warrior. This relationship of camaraderie between Anat and Baal in battle is also seen in 1.82 where they are both called upon to bind a malevolent spirit. Here, Anat is not only called upon to bind the spirit along with Baal, but she is to confine the spirit to the pit. If this is symbolic of the spirits dispatch into the underworld, then this text has affinities with Anat's actions in 1.6.i where she buries the body of Baal. This connection of Anat with the funerary cult is one that is witnessed also in the cultic texts where she is seen to have strong links with Gatharu and the *gtrm*, Shapshu and Yarikh (see below).

Perhaps the most striking conclusion we can draw from our examination of these texts is that Anat engaged in sexual intercourse with Baal and that she bore him a son. This is in complete disagreement with recent studies of Anat's character

which portrays her as a virgin goddess, an adolescent tomboy who rejects her sexuality (cf. Day 1991, 1992 and Walls 1992). Rather than viewing Anat as a goddess who is stuck between menarche and parturition, the texts support the view that Anat has a fully developed character within the narratives, and even though she is very often given the title *blt* which is indicative of her youthful status, within the logic of myth she can be both a youthful maiden and be sexually active.

CHAPTER FIVE
UGARITIC CULTIC TEXTS

5.1. Introduction	323
5.2. Texts.....	324
5.2.1. <i>KTU</i> 1.27.....	324
5.2.2. <i>KTU</i> 1.39.....	325
5.2.3. <i>KTU</i> 1.41 and 1.87.....	328
5.2.4. <i>KTU</i> 1.43.....	330
5.2.5. <i>KTU</i> 1.46.....	339
5.2.6. <i>KTU</i> 1.61.....	341
5.2.7. <i>KTU</i> 1.102.....	341
5.2.8. <i>KTU</i> 1.109.....	342
5.2.9. <i>KTU</i> 1.118, RS 20.24, <i>KTU</i> 1.148 and <i>KTU</i> 1.47.....	344
5.2.10. <i>KTU</i> 1.130.....	345
5.2.11. RIH 77/10B + 77/22	346
5.2.12. RS 20.123+.....	347
5.2.13. Hurrian Texts.....	348
5.3. Discussion.....	349
5.4. Conclusions.....	364

5.1. INTRODUCTION

It cannot be doubted that we obtain our most informed picture of Anat from a reading of the mythic texts in which she appears. The fact that they often have a narrative structure in which the goddess acts, gives us great insight into her character, and as we have already seen, her character is not copied invariably from one myth to the next, but is allowed to vary in subtle degrees to suit the particular context in which she is placed: in other words, she is a fully developed three-dimensional character who is seen to act in as complex a manner as was available to Bronze Age goddesses.

When we now turn to the cultic texts, we immediately feel the loss of this narrative framework, instead finding long lists of offerings and deities (often rather obscure) with laconic descriptions of little understood ceremonies. It might be felt that little can be gained from examining these texts since there would not appear to be much information contained in them that we could not glean from the narratives. However, a close reading of the cultic texts in which we find Anat is revealing since it does illustrate another facet to her character which may not be otherwise noticed.

In the following discussion, I shall first present those texts with which we can be confident that they include Anat. Following that, I shall review the texts looking for particular patterns, either in the sequences of deities, or in the types of offerings which are attributed to the goddess. Finally I shall attempt to draw some conclusions from these observations in order to present the character of Anat we find in the cultic texts, and to compare it with what we know of her from the myths.

5.2. TEXTS

5.2.1. KTU 1.27

This is a very fragmentary tablet of which only the lower left hand edge survives. In the first few legible lines we find a mention of Anat,

1	u*g*[rt]
	'nt*[]
	tmm l b*t*[]
	b'*l.ugrt*[]

The first line, as reconstructed by *KTU* and Xella (*TRU* 138), is probably the toponym 'Ugarit' and was likely to be part of a divine name such as we find in line four. The second line begins with the divine name 'nt but the following lacuna makes it impossible to elaborate further. This is followed by '...perfect for the house/temple' where *tmm* is taken as a designation of an offering¹ indicating its perfect state.² The next line mentions 'Baal of Ugarit' after which the tablet continues in this fragmentary state for another eleven lines before the tablet breaks. That this is likely to be a cultic text listing offerings to various deities is indicated by the terms for offerings found, such as 'birds' ('šrm) in line 5, a possible mention of 'burnt offering' (šr*[p]) in line 6, a *npš* in line 9, 'liver' (*kbd*) in line 10, possibly as a *t'*-offering (*t*[']), and perhaps a 'ram' (š) in line 12.

¹*TRU* suggests the offering was a 'head of cattle'.

²*TRU* translates *tmm* 'completo', 'senza difetto'. *MLC* (636) 'completo'. Cf. hb. 𐎠𐎫.

5.2.2. KTU 1.39

This text, which incidentally was the first text found at Ugarit (*TOu2* 135; *TEOI*), has considerable affinities with texts *KTU* 1.41 and 1.87, and a section whose sequence of deities is (almost) identical to that of *KTU* 1.102. It consists of little else than a long list of divine names and offerings, not necessarily in that order, in which we find that Anat occurs twice, in lines 7 and 17.

The first five lines list various offerings to the gods El, *ilhm*,³ *tkmn* w *šnm*, Reshef and *ilh*. Lines six to seven list the following sequence of gods, all of whom are offered a ram (š): Baal, Athirat, *tkmn*-and-*šnm*,⁴ Anat, and Reshef. From line 13 we find Anat as part of a sequence of divinities which is remarkably similar to that of *KTU* 1.102 (see below):

13) <i>il b*t.gdlt.ušhry.gdlt.ym gdlt</i>	The god of the house/temple a cow, <i>ušhry</i> a cow, Yam a cow
14) <i>b'l.gdlt.yrh.gdlt.<kt></i>	Baal a cow, Yarikh a cow, <Kothar> ⁵
15) <i>gdlt.trmn.gdlt.pdry.gdlt dqt</i>	a cow, <i>trmn</i> a cow, ⁶ Pidray a cow, <i>dqt</i> ⁷
16) <i>dqt.trt (trt).dqt.</i>	a ewe, <i>trt</i> ⁸ a ewe,
17) <i>[rš]p 'nt.hbly.dbhm.š[p]š pgr</i>	[Reshef] ⁹ (and) Anat <i>hbly</i> ¹⁰ two sacrifices, ¹¹ Shapshu- <i>pgr</i> ¹²

³There is some debate as to whether *ilhm* should be treated as the divine name of an independent deity, as an appellative for any following divine name, or simply as a plural of *il*, 'gods' (*TOu2* 136 n.12). See the discussion in Levine and de Tarragon (1993).

⁴*KTU* has *tkmn* but *TRU* (76) reads *tkmn*, as in line 3.

⁵Restored from *KTU* 1.102.5 to make sense of the otherwise difficult *yrh.gdlt. gdlt.trmn...*

⁶On the evidence for this divine name, cf. Dietrich *et al.* (1975a).

⁷This appears to be the ewe-offering deified, and is appropriately offered a ewe (*dqt*). We can be certain that this is not a mistake, as in line 14 where a divine name was missed out, since we find *dqt* among the list of divine names in *KTU* 1.102.8.

⁸*KTU* reads *trt*, an otherwise unknown lexeme, but corrects it to *trt* 'new wine' on the basis of *KTU* 1.102.9.

⁹Restored from *KTU* 1.102.10. The final *p* of the divine name *ršp* is visible here.

¹⁰Astour (1966 284) translates this 'Anat the destroyer', cf. hb. חַבַּל, ar. *ḥabāl*. *TRU* (80) follows Astour and sees this as a terrible, negative manifestation of the goddess Anat. Dietrich *et*

18) [gd]lt.iltm.hnqtm.dq*tm

a cow, the two strangling goddesses¹³ two ewes,

19) [y]r*h.kty.gdlt.w l ġlmt[.]š

Yarikh kty¹⁴ a cow, and to the ġlmt a ram

In the first sequence of deities, Anat is listed between the little known *tkmn-w-šmn*¹⁵ and Reshef, and her offering of a 'ram' (š) is nothing extraordinary. In the second sequence, however, we find not only that Anat is paired with Reshef, but that her name is followed by the lexeme *hbly*, and that they alone are given *dbhm*, rather than the more usual 'ewe' (*dqt*) or 'cow' (*gdlt*) that dominates this sequence. The fact that she appears to be linked with Reshef in both sequences despite the disparate nature of the two lists is to be noted. The divine name *ršp* is reconstructed from *KTU* 1.102, and supported by the fact that a *p* is visible after the lacuna. It could be argued that the offering for Reshef was missed out by the scribe, in much the same way as the divine name *ktr* was missed out in line 14, but the fact that we find the dual

al. (1975 143) take it as a place name, and this is also the position of de Tarragon (*TOu2* 138 n.24) who takes *hbly* as a toponym of a place where Anat was especially worshipped.

¹¹Taking *dbhm* as a dual rather than as a straight plural, given the duality of the deities Reshef and Anat to whom these sacrifices are made.

¹²*špš pgr* could be either a divine name, or *pgr* could be a type of offering. Dietrich *et al.* (1973a) note that a *pagrûm* is an offering to the dead at Mari and has a connection with Dagan at Mari and Ugarit. *TRU* (79) observes that the sun goddess has a connection with the underworld in her nocturnal journey and translates it as the divine name '*šapaš-pgr*'. De Tarragon (*TOu2* 138 n.20) believes this is a funerary offering and translates, "(à) Shapash, une offrande-pgr". However, the occurrence of what appears to be a divine name *špš pgr* is found in *KTU* 1.102.12, a list that appears to be divine names without any sacrificial terms.

¹³Xella (*TRU* 80) writes that these two goddesses recall the analogous demonic characters in Sumero-Akkadian myth (Lamaštu, Pazuzu, etc.), connected with the death of new-borns and infants in general. However, this is disputed by de Tarragon (*TOu2* 139 n.26) who points out that this is not an incantation against evil spirits. Instead, he compares *hnqtm* with ar. 'gorge, pass', and concludes that these are guardian goddesses of the hinterland mountain passes. Kapelrud's (1969 31) suggestion that one of these goddesses is Anat remains unfounded.

¹⁴De Tarragon (*TOu2* 139) suggests "Yarikh Cassite".

¹⁵This deity (or deities) plays a minor role in *KTU* 1.114.18. For a discussion of this deity, see Pardee (1988 59f.).

*dbḥm*¹⁶ after Anat *ḥbly*, suggests that these two deities were listed together. The lexeme *ḥbly* is generally taken either as a toponym or as an epithet meaning ‘destroyer’. Dietrich *et al.* (1975 143) compare it to ^{URU}*Ḥa-ba-a[l]-la*, a possible toponym in RS 20.225, Gray (1978 100) thinks it might be a scribal corruption of *ḥlb(y)* (Aleppo), and de Tarragon (*TOu2* 138 n.24) believes this to be a place where the goddess Anat was especially worshipped. For the other side, Astour (1966 284) takes *ḥbly* to mean ‘destroyer’, and is followed *inter alia* by Kapelrud (1969 31), Rainey (1975 251 n.81), Herdner (1978 5) and Xella (*TRU* 80).

The decision between these two options is aided by examining the context in which ‘*nt ḥbly*’ occurs. First we note her link with Reshef, who was reckoned to be among other things a god who brought death (Dahood 1958 85; Fulco 1976). Secondly, after Anat we find *špš pgr* and *iltm ḥnqtm*. Dietrich *et al.* (1973a) notes that at Mari, *pagrûm* is an offering made to the dead. Xella (*TRU* 79) points out that Shapshu has a funerary connection in her nocturnal journey through the land of the dead every night. Since the form *špš pgr* occurs in *KTU* 1.102.11 which simply lists a sequence of divine names without offerings, it seems appropriate to assume this is a divine name and that it designates Shapshu in her connection with the underworld (Lewis 1989 35f.). As for ‘the two strangling goddesses’ we find in this pair a rather sinister couple, whose characters are otherwise unknown to us. Within this context of deities who are perceived to have a dark, unwelcome nature, ‘Anat the destroyer’ fits perfectly as, for example, a manifestation of Anat as we see her in *KTU* 1.3.ii. The fact that we do not have a feminine suffix on *ḥbly* is not a cause for concern since we find several other feminine epithets with suffixed -y (*UT* 8.54).

¹⁶That this is probably to be understood as a dual cannot be decided from its orthography, but is suggested by the fact that a plural form would not indicate the number of offerings. See Xella’s (*TRU* 79) comments on the form *t’m* in line 1 of text 1.39.

5.2.3. *KTU* 1.41 and 1.87

The fragmentary tablet *KTU* 1.41, comprising of two pieces found in 1929 and 1930,¹⁷ is restored according to the almost identical text *KTU* 1.87 recovered in 1954, and therefore these two will be treated together.¹⁸ The fact that more than one copy of this text has been found suggests it was of some importance in the cult, but exactly what might have been its role is a matter of contention.¹⁹ It seems safe to assume that it conveys details of a ritual that took place in the month of *riš yn*, i.e., the new vintage, and that the king was involved. However, de Moor's (1972 and *ARTU*) characteristic appraisal of this text as a description of the rites of a New Year celebration of the return of Baal is one that has very little evidence in the text itself.

The first proposed mention of Anat in this text²⁰ comes in line 10. A comparison of the two texts at this point reveals that it is only the letter *n* from text 1.87 that suggests the divine name '*nt* at this point.²¹

¹⁷RS 1.003 and 2.[005] (*TEOI*).

¹⁸The differences between these two texts are succinctly set out in Dietrich *et al.* (1975 144f.).

¹⁹For a recent discussion of 1.43 see Levine and de Tarragon (1993).

²⁰'The text' in this discussion means the reconstructed text of 1.41 and 1.87; line numbers are based on text 1.41 unless otherwise stated (Levine and de Tarragon 1993 77).

²¹De Moor (1972 15 n.42) claims to read '*n[t]* after text 1.87 but as far as I can tell, no '*i*' is visible on either tablet at this point. Cf. UT 173.12 []*n*[]. De Moor (1972 14) also places a far bigger gap between the end of the restored verb '*db* and the divine name which suggests a whole word is missing, whereas *KTU* recognises hardly any gap and de Moor (*ARTU* 160) later translates the text as if no text were missing.

Text 1.41 and 1.87	Reconstruction
(1.41.9) <i>k*</i> 'g <i>m</i> * <i>l</i> *[]s.w[]k*(?)p*(?)[]	<i>k</i> 'g <i>ml</i> .s.w[.] <i>k</i> *(?)p*(?)[]d[] <i>m</i> *
(1.87) <i>k</i> '*[] <i>ml</i> .[]d[] <i>m</i> *	
(1.41.10) <i>w yn</i> [] <i>rt.y</i> * <i>d</i> *(?)[]	<i>w yn</i> [] <i>rt.y</i> * <i>d</i> *[] <i>n</i> []
(1.87) <i>w y</i> *[] <i>n</i> []	
(1.41.11) <i>w al</i> *[] <i>il.w b u</i> *[]	<i>w al</i> *[] <i>il.w b u</i> *[]
(1.87) []	

As we can see, even comparing the two tablets together, the text at the end of line 10 is very uncertain. If we accept this *n* as evidence for the presence of the divine name 'nt, the text would be translated as 'two ewes (?) and a town-pigeon (?) he will prepare/were prepared (?) for Anat (?)'. However, with all these question marks hanging over the text, it is best to simply acknowledge this as a possible reference to Anat but not to press the issue further.

With the second reference in line 16 we are on much firmer ground. In a sequence of deities identical to that of *KTU* 1.39.6f. we find the following are each offered a ram (§):

- 15) *b*'*l**[.]*s**.at*tr**[.]*s*.*tk*[*m***n**[.]*w**[§*nm*.§] Baal a ram, Athirat a ram, *tkmn w §nm*²² a ram,
 16) 'nt §[.]*r***s*p §[.]*dr.il.w phr.b*'*l*] Anat a ram, Reshef a ram, the family of El and the assembly of Baal

Text 1.41.12-19 and 1.39.3-9 are copies of the same text and therefore these two texts are not independent sequences in which Anat and Reshef are side by side. However, they do reveal that the underlying text was a standard and could be used in various ritual ceremonies.

²²This is the least certain of the divine names, but with *m***n**[]*w**[] visible and enough space for this divine name to fit, it seems reasonable to assume that this is what was written.

5.2.4. KTU 1.43

This text deals with a ritual carried out when Athtart *hr*²³ enters the house of the king, and appears to centre around a group of divine statues to whom offerings are made. After the opening section in which some clothing and animals are offered, we find the following text,

	-----		-----
	<i>'lm.t'rbn.gtrm.</i>		Then the <i>gtrm</i> enter
10	<i>bt.mlk.tql.hrš.</i>		the house of the king. A shekel of gold
	<i>l špš.w yrh.l gtr.</i>		for Shapshu and Yarikh, for Gatharu
	<i>tql.ksp.tb.ap*w*.np*š</i>		a shekel of good ²⁴ silver, a <i>ap</i> and <i>npš</i> ²⁵
	<i>l 'nth*.tql.hrš</i>		for ' <i>nth</i> '. ²⁶ A shekel of gold
	<i>l špš[w y]rh.l gtr.tn</i>		for Shapshu and Yarikh, for Gatharu
15	<i>[tql.ksp].tb²⁷.ap.w npš</i>		two shekels of good silver, a <i>ap</i> and <i>npš</i>
	<i>[]²⁸.bt.alp.w š</i>		[for ' <i>nth</i> .] In the temple a bull and ram.
	-----		-----

²³The translation of the phrase '*ttrt hr*' is disputed. On the one hand *hr* is taken as a cognate of hb. 𐤅𐤕𐤍 III, akk. *hurru* 'hole', e.g., Dietrich *et al.* (1975b 526) "der Höhle", and *TOu2* (161) "Athtart-de-la-grotte". On the other hand, *hr* has been taken as a toponym, 'Hurri', e.g., *TRU* (87) "Aṭtart di Ḫurri", and Dietrich and Loretz (1992 45) who now take it as 'Athtart of Hurri'.

²⁴Dietrich *et al.* (1975b 528) suggest a correspondence to akk. *kaspu damqu*.

²⁵Anatomical features of the sacrificial animal, 'nose and throat' (?) or 'un museau et un poumon' (*TOu2* 162).

²⁶*TRU* (90) suggests that perhaps '*nth*' is a misspelling by the scribe. What is probably the second occurrence is lost in the lacuna at the beginning of line 16, which prevents us from verifying this unique orthography.

²⁷Dietrich and Loretz (1992 41) read *tq*l*[.ksp].**.

²⁸*TRU* (86) and *ARTU* (170) suggest [*l.ilt*] giving 'for the goddess of the House/temple'. This could be understood as a parallel reference to Anat, but we do not know of Anat bearing this title elsewhere, and the other deities in this ceremony are all named twice in exactly the same way which would suggest that if this particular restoration were accepted it would indicate a goddess other than Anat. I prefer the restoration of Dietrich and Loretz (1992 41), [*l 'nth*], since it preserves the parallel structure of lines 10-13 with 13-16.

This short passage introduces us to some intriguing concepts in the Ugaritic cult. First, we have the *gtrm* who enter the house of the king and who appear to have some relationship with Shapshu and Yarikh, the deified sun and moon. Second, we find what appears to be the divine name ‘Anat’ with a 3s pronominal suffix, which raises certain grammatical problems familiar to us from the long-running debate over *l’šrth* in the inscriptions from Khirbet el-Qôm and Kuntillet ‘Ajrûd.

Here in text 1.43 we see the *gtrm* entering into the house of the king and receiving offerings. Dietrich and Loretz (1992 42) interpret the phrase in line 14 *gtr tn* to mean ‘the second *gtr*’, and conclude that *gtr* in line 12 is a reference to Shapshu and *gtr tn* to Yarikh. However there are several difficulties arising from this interpretation. The first results from the fact that at Ugarit Shapshu was feminine and yet if Dietrich and Loretz are correct, we find her designated by the masculine form *gtr* rather than an expected **gtrt*. A possible solution may be to understand *gtr* as a proper noun designating a member of the *gtrm* rather than as a simple adjective, in which case it need not take the feminine suffix. If this is the case then it may explain the phrase ‘*nt gtr*’ in text 1.108 as two proper nouns in apposition. A further difficulty lies in translating the phrase *gtr tn* as ‘the second strong one’, since this parses *tn* as an ordinal but Gordon (*UT* 7.45) points out that in Ugaritic, as with Akkadian, ordinals *precede* the noun unlike Hebrew. In this case, if we restore *tql ksp* in the lacuna at the beginning of line 15 then we have the phrase *tn tql ksp tb*, ‘two shekels of good silver’ (*ARTU* 170, *TOu2* 162). I prefer to see the involvement of four deities in this ritual: Shapshu and Yarikh who are called ‘the two strong ones’, Gatharu and Anat.

Other alphabetic cuneiform texts in which the lexeme *gtr* is found are *KTU* 1.108, 1.109, and 2.4. If *gtr* can be equated with syllabic *gašaru* then we also

find it in the polyglot vocabulary RS 20.123+. In this last text we find the following equations,²⁹

10	<i>d_bf.zil.lala</i>	<i>be[-.] ? ?</i>	<i>? []</i>
	<i>d_ka.ni.sur.ra</i>	<i>ka-ni-z[u-r]a(?) -an(?)</i>	<i>li-?[]</i>
	<i>d_lú.làl</i>	<i>lu-la-a[h-h]é</i>	<i>lu-l[a]</i>
	<i>d_la-ta-ra-ak</i>	<i>ša-ar-ra[-a](?) -ni</i>	<i>ni-d[a(?)]</i>
	<i>d_ssara</i>	<i>ha-ma-ar-ri</i>	<i>qi-i[d-šu(?)]</i>
15	<i>d_tišpak</i>	<i>mi-il-ku-un-ni</i>	<i>ga-š[a-ru]</i>
	<i>d_nin.a.zu</i>	<i>ši-ru-ḫi</i>	<i>il[]</i>
	<i>d[U]₄</i>	<i>tu-en-ni</i>	<i>ya-m[u]</i>
	<i>d[ut]u</i>	<i>ši-mi-gi</i>	<i>ša-ap-šu</i>
	<i>d_a.a</i>	<i>e-ḫa-an</i>	<i>ku-šar-ru</i>
IVb [3 (?) lines]		
	[. . . b[a(?) -ti[]
5 (?)	[pa-ad(?) -r]i-ya-m[a(?)]
	[.(.) m]u-te-ma
	[aš(?) -r]a-tum
	[. . i]a(?) -lu-u[r	.]? -ra-tum
	[ta-at-]mi-iš [da-ad]-mi-šu
10 (?)	[. .]-hé	[. . a]l(?)ni-nu-wa
	[mi(?) -il(?) -k]u-un	[ga(?) -]ša(?) -ru
	[a-n]a-tum[a]-na-tum
	[]mi-il-ku-u[n(?)]	g[a]-ša-ru
	[<i>d_lugal.bàn.da(?)</i>]	<i>ši-mi-gi</i>	<i>š[a]-ap-šu</i>
15 (?)	[<i>d_nin.sún (?)</i>]	<i>a-ḫa-ku-un</i>	<i>a-ḫa-ku</i>
	<i>d_l[ugal.má]r(?) .d[a(?)]</i>	<i>aš-ta-bi-[n]i(?)</i>	<i>aš-ta-ru</i>
	<i>d_i.zu.an.na</i>	<i>te-eš-ša-a[b]</i>	<i>ba-a-lu</i>
	<i>d_šu.zi.an.na</i>	<i>ta-at-mi-i]š</i>	<i>da-ad-mi-šu]</i>

Here we find three mentions of an Ugaritic god *gašaru* (= *gtr* ?): in lines IVa.15, IVb.11 and 13. The first equates the Mesopotamian god *Tišpak* with Hurrian *milkunni* and Ugaritic *gašaru*, but in the second and third equations we lack the Mesopotamian equivalent due to the damaged nature of the text. Line 11 is very fragmentary and the restoration *milkun* = *gašaru* is only tentative, but the reading

²⁹Text from Nougayrol (1968 240f.) beginning at col. IVa line 10.

milkun = *gašaru* of line 13 is more assured. Whatever the identity of the Mesopotamian gods, they were of sufficiently similar character to be equated with the Hurrian god *milkun* and with Ugaritic *gašaru*. The appearance of *gašaru* alongside other more well known Ugaritic deities such as Anat, Shapshu, Athtar, Baal and Dadmish would seem to point in favour of accepting that *gtr* could in some circumstances be the proper name of an independent deity, rather than an epithet of another deity. This is supported by the existence of several theophoric personal names from Ugarit whose divine element is *gtr* (Gröndahl 1967; Dietrich and Loretz 1980 175). It is interesting to note in lines IVb.11f. the grouping of Gatharu, Anat and Shapshu which is similar to that of *KTU* 1.43. However, whatever conclusions, if any, should be drawn from this similarity must take account of the fact that in this text, the sequence is a result of the order of the Mesopotamian deities listed rather than Ugaritic theology.

If *gtr* is the proper name of independent deity in RS 20.123+, this also seems to be true for *KTU* 2.4. At the end of a fragmentary letter addressed to the high priest (*rb khn*), and found in the house of the high priest during the first season's excavation (*TOu2* 271f.) we read,

- | | | |
|----|---|--|
| 17 | [w]ht. yšm'. uhy
lgy. wyhbṭ. baš (bnš) | And now, may my brother listen
to my voice, and may he appoint ³⁰ the personnel, ³¹ |
|----|---|--|

³⁰Pardee (1988 91 n.56) translates "et qu'il désigne (?) le personnel". *TOu2* (273), following the suggestion of *UT* (19.740) who turns to ar. *hbṭ* 'to lower', translates "et l'homme sera abaissé".

³¹Accepting the textual emendation from *a* to *n*, a matter of one wedge. I prefer the translation of Pardee (1988 91 n.56) who sees this as a description of a cultic act in which the statues of Gatharu and Baal are placed into the hands of two personnel (*bnš*), rather than *TOu2* (271f.) who sees this as a wish for an unnamed party to be delivered into the hands of *ihqm* and *ytrhd* by Gatharu and Baal respectively. The only difficulty with this is that *bnš* is singular whilst the following text makes it clear that two men are spoken of. However, given the fact that the scribe has already made a mistake at this point, it is not too difficult to believe that the plural suffix was unwritten. Either interpretation does not alter the fact of a deity named Gatharu in this text.

	<i>w ytn. ilm. bdhm</i>	and may he put the gods in their hands.
20	<i>bd[.] iḥqm. gtr</i>	In the hand of <i>iḥqm</i> (may he put) Gatharu,
	<i>w bd ytrhd</i>	and in the hand of <i>ytrhd</i> (may he put)
	<i>b'l</i>	Baal.

In this text *gtr* appears to be paralleled with *b'l* and one possible way of reading this text would understand *gtr* as an epithet of Baal ('the Strong One'), in parallel to the divine name proper. However, since there appear to be two 'personnel' (*iḥqm* and *ytrhd*) into whose hands (*bdhm* with dual pronominal suffix) the gods/statues are placed (*ytn*), and since also the dual form *ilm* ('the two gods') is used rather than the singular *il*, it is reasonable to assume that two independent gods are involved.

Turning to text 1.108, we find the lexeme *gtr* in a context which makes it hard to determine its function. In the first three lines we find the following,

1	<i>[hl]n*. yšt. rpu. mlk. 'lm. wyšt</i>
	<i>[il] ḡ*tr. wyqr. il. ytb. b'ttrt</i>
	<i>il* tpz. bhd r'y. dyšr. wydmr</i>

The translation of the opening lines of this text is fraught with difficulties, to the extent that even the number of deities involved is difficult to ascertain. Virolleaud (1968 553) in the *editio princeps* saw this text introducing the god *rpu*, an epithet of the Ugaritic high god El, and took *gtr w yqr* as two adjectives describing this god: *gtr* was compared with akk. *gašru* 'strong', and *yqr* with hb. *קָדֹר* 'precious', and with his restoration [*il*] at the beginning of line 2, he offered the translation, "et il boit (2) [le dieu] fort et majestueux". This has been followed by the majority of scholars, although Margulis (1970 293) argued for *gtr* as a drink (Syriac *gétrâ* 'wine sediment'; Caquot 1976), whilst *TOu2* (114 n.348) sees *gtr* as an "entité liée au culte des morts" (and the *gtrm*) just as *rpu* is intimately linked with the Rephaim.

TOu2's interpretation of text 1.108 sees *yqr* as the proper name of the founder of the Ugaritic dynasty (*PRU* 3 xxxvif.; Kitchen 1977) and a member of the

Rephaim on the basis of an Ugaritic text *RIH* 77/21B (Bordreuil and Caquot 1979 301f.) in which we find in line 14' of the recto *rpi.yqr* [...], "le Rephaïte Yaqar". Bordreuil and Caquot (1979 303) suggest that since we find *yqr* in this text from Ras Ibn Hani, as well as *gtrn.ylk* [...] in line 8' of the verso, we should now translate *KTU* 1.108.2 as "Gathar et Yaqar le dieu siégeant avec Athtart"; in other words, *gtr* and *yqr* are names of two members of the Rephaim. Their translation appears to link the two names into one identity labelled 'the god' (*il*), but it takes little account of the stichometry of the opening lines of this text, nor of the fact that nowhere else do these two appear merged. This also appears to be the position of de Moor (*ARTU* 187) who translates this text "And let [the god] Gathru-and-Yaqaru drink", noting that this 'double deity' was probably "deified ancestors of the Ugaritic dynasty". *TOu2*, following Bordreuil and Caquot (1979), prefers to see Gatharu and Yaqar as members of the Rephaim whose god (*il*) is "le Rephaïte", the eponymous leader of the *rpum* (Xella 1981 47). This would then make *gtr* the personal name of an otherwise unknown Ugaritic king, or an epithet 'the strong one' of a king (i.e., a divinised king like *yqr*). Dietrich and Loretz (1992 65f.) also follow this line of interpretation arguing that since *yqr* is a divinised ancestor then so is *gtr*. However, this analysis fails to acknowledge that Gatharu is the name of a deity who appears to be the equal of Baal (*KTU* 2.4) and ranks among the most prominent gods at Ugarit (RS 20.123+) rather than appearing to be a divinised ancestor, in which case it seems inappropriate to accept that *rpū* is the god of Gatharu and Yaqar, or that they are equivalents (Pardee 1988 91f.).

The least appealing solution is offered by Good (1991 159) who sees *gtr* as a geographical term the equivalent of hb. גִּשְׁרִי, a region east of the upper Jordan and which, according to Good, might have encompassed the region of Ashtaroth and Edrei. This undoubtedly arises from the translation of '*ttrt* and *hdr'y* as the place names 'Athtartu' and 'Hidrayu' (Margulis 1970 294, Dietrich and Loretz 1980 176,

Pardee 1988 94, Good 1991 159) as opposed to taking them as divine names, 'Athtart' and 'Haddu the Shepherd' (*inter alia* Virolleaud 1968 555). However intriguing Good's suggestion may be for *gtr*, he is unable to explain *yqr* in a similar fashion and leaves it untranslated, explaining that, "my translation deliberately allows alternative interpretations of the original".

In my opinion, the best solution to the problem of *gtr* in this text is that offered by Virolleaud (1968) who saw in *gtr* and *yqr* two adjectives, and supposed that *il* belonged in the lacuna at the beginning of the line. However, I find the arguments of Margulis (1970) and others concerning the translation of '*ttrt* and *hdr'y*' to be persuasive. In this analysis, the text opens with two bicolons describing the god 'Rapiu'. In the first bicolon he is described as *mlk* '*lm* in the first colon and with the adjectives 'strong and worthy' in the second. The second bicolon further defines the god *rpu* including relevant topographical information. We might translate these opening lines thus,

Behold, may Rapiu the Eternal King drink,
and may the god strong and noble drink.
The god enthroned at Athtartu,
the god judging at Hidrayu.

If we accept that *gtr* in line 2 is an adjective, then what are we to make of it in line 6 which reads, *wtšt. 'nt. gtr. b'lt. mlk?* The difficulty of taking it as an adjective or epithet of Anat is that it lacks the feminine suffix (Caquot 1976 299, Pardee 1988 101f., Good 1991 159), while an appeal to the ambiguous gender of the goddess is unconvincing (de Moor 1969 177). Virolleaud (1968 555) emended *gtr* to *gtrt* in order to make it a feminine adjective linked to the divine name 'Anat', and this proposal has been often followed, although not universally. Margulis (1970 293) argues that *gtr* in line 6 is the object of the verb *šty* ('drink') and that it is a beverage

as he argues for line 2 (followed by Caquot 1976). A further possibility would be to see in *gtr* the divine name 'Gatharu' and translate the phrase as 'Anat of Gatharu'. Recent analysis of the phrase '*nt gtr*' sees '*nt*' as the divine name in construct with *gtr* as a genitive, either as a nominalised adjective 'strength' (Dietrich and Loretz 1980 174, Pardee 1988 102) or as the proper name or epithet 'Strong One' (*Tou2* 115, Dietrich and Loretz 1992 73). The translation 'Anat of Gatharu' seems to be supported by *KTU* 1.43 in which we find a link between Anat and Gatharu where in line 13 we find '*nth*', probably to be translated as 'his Anat' (*ARTU* 170, Dietrich and Loretz 1992). However, it is difficult to decide between taking *gtr* of line 6 as the proper name of the god Gatharu or as the designation 'the Strong One' where this is a reference to the god Rapiu, who in line two is described as *gtr* and *yrq*. There seems little reason to introduce the god Gatharu into the text at this point when in line two *gtr* is an adjective describing Rapiu. An interpretation which takes the phrase '*nt gtr*' to mean 'Anat of the Strong One' where *gtr* is a reference to Rapiu of line 1 is attractive, although the evidence of 1.43 suggests 'Anat of Gatharu' (i.e. the god of this name) would be better. With such scant evidence as we have, any decision we make has to be provisional, and my preference for the latter explanation remains tentative.

In texts *KTU* 1.109 and 1.112 we find mention of the *gtrm* in less problematical contexts. In 1.109.24f., after a line ruling off the previous section, we find the following,

	<i>w.šnpt.il š</i>	And as <i>šnpt</i> -offering, El a ram,
25	<i>l 'nt.hls.tn šm</i>	for Anat <i>hls</i> ³² two rams,
	<i>l gtrm.ğšb šmal</i>	for <i>gtrm</i> the left <i>ğšb</i>
	<i>d alp.m.w alp w š</i>	of two bulls, and a bull and a ram
	<i>šrp.w šlmm kmm</i>	as a <i>šrp</i> -offering, and as <i>šlmm</i> -offerings, ditto.

³²For a discussion of Anat *hls* see the section on *KTU* 1.109 below.

In this text the *gtrm* are listed directly after Anat *hlš*. The fact that Anat receives two rams, and on the other hand that parts of two bulls are offered to the *gtrm*, is strongly reminiscent of text 1.43 in which two *gtrm* are named, along with two Anats (cf. *gtrm* and *'ntm* in 1.43.18, 19 and 20).

In 1.112.17f. we find details of cultic practice which involves the *gtrm* 'coming down' to feast and a description of cultic recitation and singing,

17	... <i>b arb't</i> <i>'šrt. yrdn. gtrm</i> <i>mšdh. tñ šm l gtrm</i>	... On the fourteenth day the <i>gtrm</i> go down to the meal, two rams for the <i>gtrm</i>
20	<i>w rgm. gtrm yttb</i> <i>w* qdš. yšr ...</i>	and the message of the <i>gtrm</i> was repeated and the holy one sings ...

In this text we see that the *gtrm* are offered two rams, which might indicate that *gtrm* is here a dual, as in *KTU* 1.43 and possible in 1.109, although it is possible that a larger group might have been offered two sacrificial animals.

We have seen in this discussion that the lexeme *gtr* can be used in three different ways. Virolleaud's (1968) observation of the akk. *gašaru* 'strong' as the most likely cognate is attractive, and is used as an adjective in 1.108.2 (|| *yqr*). However, there is sufficient evidence to suggest that there was an independent deity named Gatharu (ranked alongside other major Ugaritic deities) whose name probably meant 'the Strong One' and who was likely to have been the eponymous leader of the group of *gtrm* who included in its ranks such deities as Shapshu, Yarikh and Anat herself. Finally, *gtr* could be used as a proper noun to designate a deity as a member of the *gtrm*.

It appears that the *gtrm* was a group of deities lead by the eponymous Gatharu.³³ From text 1.43 it appears that Shapshu and Yarikh were members of this group, and text 1.108 shows us that Anat may also have been included as a spouse (?) of Gatharu; perhaps even Rapiu if the use of the adjective *gtr* was an intentional indication of such status. The grammatical problem of affixing a pronominal suffix onto a divine name (*KTU* 1.43.13) could be overcome by insisting that this is a spelling mistake (*TRU* 90), but perhaps the problem can also be alleviated if we understand that these references to Anat probably refer to cultic statues of the goddess and that perhaps the underlying physical reality that '*nt* = '(cultic statue of) Anat' makes such a use of the pronominal suffix plausible. This question is still debated for the similar occurrence of *l'šrth* at Kuntillet 'Ajrud and Khirbet el-Qôm for which no universally acceptable solution has yet been found (Ackerman 1992 62f., Wiggins 1993 166f.). Perhaps these references provide enough support for the theory that divine names can accept pronominal suffixes?³⁴

5.2.5. *KTU* 1.46

This text describes a series of cultic acts involving offerings to various deities, and which involves the king. The tablet appears to be a fragment of a larger one, and from line 10b onwards appears to be a duplicate of text 1.109, in which case it is possible that lines 1-10a are the missing text from 1.109 (*TRU* 57, Dijkstra 1984, *TOu2* 164). Dijkstra (1984 69) has attempted to reconstruct the whole text on the assumption that *KTU* 1.46, 1.28, 1.56, 1.31, and 1.27 all belong to the same tablet.

³³Dietrich and Loretz (1992 65f.) give a valuable discussion of the history of scholarship on this group and conclude that they probably play a chthonian role but that there is not enough detail to say much more than that.

³⁴See further the references cited by de Moor in *ARTU* (170 n.18).

However, on his own admission, his reconstruction is highly tentative and it is perhaps prudent to focus on the text we actually have rather than on Dijkstra's reconstruction.

In 1.46 we find the divine name twice, the first in line 5 at the end of a list of offerings to various deities,

3	[š. il š. b'l š. dgn š*	... a ram, El a ram, Baal a ram, Dagan a ram,
4	['t]*r. w[.]**t]*pl. gdl. š*pn.	... Athtar and 't]*pl ³⁵ a cow, Saphon a ewe,
	dqt		
5	[al]p* **n*t*. gdl. b tlt mrm*	... a bull, Anat a cow. On the third day, some young animals ³⁶

There does not seem to be anything extraordinary here. The fact that Anat is offered a cow (*gdl*), and that in the previous line the binomial '*ttr w 't]*pl* is also offered a cow, might suggest that the *p* read immediately after the lacuna might be the final *p* in the divine name Reshef rather than the suggested *alp*, similar to text 1.39.17 (restored after *KTU* 1.102.10). However, in 1.39 the two divine names are followed by what appears to be a dual *dbhm* ('two sacrifices') whereas in 1.46.5, *gdl* is the familiar singular form and not the dual (**gdlm*), although theoretically it could be the plural, although this would mean that an unspecified number of cows were dedicated which would be uncharacteristic of these cultic texts.

The second occurrence of the divine name '*nt* in this text is in line 17. However, since the end of this text is extremely fragmentary and can only be restored thanks to text 1.109, this second attestation will be discussed under text 1.109 line 13.

³⁵The divine name '*t]*pl* is only attested here, but a variant '*t]*pr* is found in 1.107.16 and 1.123.10 where it is also associated with Athtar as the second element in a divine binomial (*TRU* 57, *TOu2* 165 n.80).

³⁶*TRU* (58) "2 giovani equidi/asini" [2 young horses/asses], cf. akk. *māru*, *mūru* and is used especially with horses and bovines. Dijkstra (1984 73) a topographical name or cultic place, cf. *mrym špn*, *mrym lbnn*, or hb. *marôm* 'high place'. *TOu2* (165 n.81) *mrm* also appears in 1.12.i.11, cf. akk. *māru* II 'young animal'.

5.2.6. KTU 1.61

Due to the extensive damage to this fragment, it is impossible to state with any certainty the nature of this text. There is a possible reference to Anat in the first line, preceded by the preposition *k*, or perhaps by a word whose root ends in *k* or has the second person pronominal suffix. Whether the lexeme '*nt*' should be taken as the divine name 'Anat' is also uncertain, but I give the text in the interest of completeness.

1 []x.[]k '*nt**[]
[]xš*[]*hrth*
[]*rhšnn*
[]*isrnn*
5 []n**ḥh*

5.2.7. KTU 1.102

With this text we return to much firmer ground. The first fourteen lines of 1.102 corresponds remarkably closely to text 1.39.13-19, and it is within this list that we find a reference to Anat. The text of the verso and its relationship to that of the recto is somewhat problematical (De Moor 1970 326, Dietrich *et al.* 1975c, *TRU* 329). The text of the recto reads,

1.102	1.39
<i>il bt</i>	<i>il b*t</i>
<i>uṣḥry</i>	<i>uṣḥry</i>
<i>ym.b'l</i>	<i>ym, b'l</i>
<i>yrḥ</i>	<i>yrḥ</i>
<i>ktr</i>	
<i>trmn</i>	<i>trmn</i>
<i>pdry</i>	<i>pdry</i>
<i>dqt</i>	<i>dqt</i>
<i>trt</i>	<i>trt</i>
<i>ršp</i>	[<i>rš</i>]p
<i>'nt ḥbly</i>	<i>'nt ḥbly</i>
<i>špš pgr</i>	š[p]š pgr
<i>iltm ḥnqtm</i>	<i>iltm ḥnqtm</i>
<i>yrḥ.kty</i>	[y]r* <i>ḥ.kty</i>

As we can see, it is simply a list of divine names with no cultic rubric, no introduction, no sacrificial offerings. However, its correspondence with text 1.39 would suggest that it follows the rubric of a particular cultic ceremony, as described in 1.39, rather than ranking the gods according to some abstract theological principle (*TRU* 329).

5.2.8. *KTU* 1.109

Text 1.109.1-14a is a copy of text 1.46.10f. which enables us to carry on reading the text past the point at which text 1.46 breaks off. In fact, 1.46 ends with a mention of Anat but the damage to that tablet means that most of the last few lines are restored using text 1.109. In line 13f. Anat Saphon is offered a bull and a ram (*alp.w š*), in line 17 Anat Saphon³⁷ is again offered a bull and a ram, in line 22 Anat is offered a ram (*š*), and in line 36 we find a broken reference to Anat Saphon. In line 24f. we find a further reference to Anat.

24	<i>w. šnpt. il š</i>	And as a <i>šnpt</i> -offering, El a ram,
25	<i>l 'nt. ḫlš.³⁸ tn šm</i>	for Anat <i>ḫlš</i> two rams,
26	<i>l gtrm. ḡšb šmal</i>	for <i>gtrm</i> the left <i>ḡšb</i> ³⁹
27	<i>d alpm. w alp w š</i>	of two bulls, and a bull and a ram
28	<i>šrp. w šlmm kmm</i>	as a <i>šrp</i> -offering, and as <i>šlmm</i> -offerings, ditto.

There is debate over the meaning and division of *ḫlš*. Virolleaud (1968 591) and Herdner (1978 16) read the initial letter as *ḫ* as opposed to *KTU*'s *ḫ*. Unfortunately, without recourse to a photograph of this tablet it is impossible to

³⁷Not '*nt ltn* read by *UT* (text 9), Oldenburg (1969 90), Binger (1992).

³⁸The transcription of Virolleaud (1968 591) and Herdner (1978 16) have *ḫlš*. *KTU* reads *ḫlš*, followed by Xella (1981 50), *TOu2* (190).

³⁹The meaning of *ḡšb* is uncertain. De Moor (1970 325) compares ar. *ḡadbat* 'swelling, protuberance' and especially the skin of the protuberance between the horns of a bull, as well as akk. *ḫabāšu* 'to swell'.

decide what should be the proper reading: *hlš* and *hlš* are otherwise unknown. De Moor (1970 325) reads *hlš* but does not know whether this is an appellative or a place name and leaves it untranslated, and this is similar to the position of *TOu2* (190 n.146), which reads *hlš*. Janowski (1980 236) also reads *hlš* but offers no translation. *TRU* (54) translates “Anat della devastazione”, comparing *hlš* to hb. *חָלַשׁ* ‘1. be weak, 2. weaken’, and states that it is practically synonymous with *hbly*. Virolleaud (1968) and Herdner (1978) prefer to divide the text *l’nt hl š*, i.e., ‘for Anat *hl* a ram, two rams for the *gtrm*’. Virolleaud (1968 593) compares *hl* with hb. *חֵץ* ‘strength’, but Herdner (1978 20) is more cautious, suggesting that *hl* is a toponym because an adjective would require a feminine suffix. He prefers to divide *hlš* in two on the basis of the phrase *tn šm l gtrm* in *KTU* 1.112.19, which he then reads in text 1.109 after the reference to Anat. However, we should be very cautious in using comparative evidence, since there does not appear to be any consistency in the number and types of offering dedicated to deities across the many cultic texts, and appears to depend more on the actual ritual than on abstract theological principles. The context of 1.112.19 is quite different from that of 1.109.24f. and cannot be used to determine the offerings given to the *gtrm* in this latter text. Furthermore, if we divide the text in the way suggested by Virolleaud and Herdner, we would be left with an unusually long list of offerings designated as *šrp*- and *šlmm*-offerings. In the division offered above, the duality of the offerings to Anat *hlš* and the *gtrm* recalls text 1.43 in which the two *gtrm*, Shapshu and Yarikh, are presented with offerings along with two Anats (*’ntm*).

In text 1.109 we find distinctions made between Anat and Anat Saphon, but this does not appear out of place in a text which also distinguishes between Baal, Baal Saphon and Baal of Ugarit.

5.2.9. *KTU 1.118, RS 20.24, KTU 1.148 and KTU 1.47*

These four texts present us with a list of deities, the order of which appears to have been fairly well established.⁴⁰ Texts 1.118 and 1.47 are simple lists of deities, and although 1.47 is much less well preserved than 1.118 (Herdner 1978 1f.), they appear to be identical with the one exception that 1.47 adds *il špn* ('the gods of Saphon', Healey 1985 117) at the beginning. This same list is found translated into Akkadian in RS 20.24 (Nougayrol 1968 42f.) beginning with DINGIR *a-bi* (= *ilib*), and thus lacking an equivalent for the *il špn* of 1.47. Once again, the text of RS 20.24 is simply a list of deities. The same order of deities appears at the beginning of text 1.148, but the lacunae make it impossible to be absolutely certain of the deities involved and the order in which they are arranged. It is not certain that *il špn* should be restored as the first deity to receive an offering (*TRU* 96) or whether the list should begin with *ilib* (*KTU*).

In 1.118.20 we find '*nt*', preceded by *atrt* and followed by *špš*, and this is reflected in RS 20.24.19f., *daš-ra-tum*, *da-na-tum*, *dšamaš* (text 1.47 is unreadable at this point). In 1.148.7 we find *atrt.š. 'nt.š.špš.š.arsy.š. 'ttrt.š* which again confirms this sequence, and which informs us that in this ritual, Anat is offered a ram (š). If we were to judge from the mythical texts, the order of the deities in this list is other than strictly hierarchical. It begins with a collection of male divinities ending with a series of Baals, after which is a collection of deities whose order is rather mysterious, although they appear to be enveloped between the pairs 'earth and heaven' and 'mountains and valleys'. After this appears a collection of female deities beginning with Athirat, then Anat, Shapshu, Arsy, *ušhry* and Athtart. This is followed by a rather miscellaneous collection of deities. Notice that although in mythical texts, both

⁴⁰See the recent discussion of these texts by Healey (1985 and 1988).

from Ugarit and Egypt, Anat is sometimes paired with Athtart, here there is no apparent connection: instead, Anat is sandwiched between Athirat and Shapshu.

5.2.10. *KTU* 1.130

This tablet, published by Milik (1978 135f.) under the number RS 24.255, has been given the wrong number in the *editio princeps*; it should be RS 24.284 (*TEO* 302). In lines 13-14 we read, *l'nt špn alp wš*, 'For Anat Saphon a bull and a ram'. Although the text is badly damaged before these lines, we can be fairly certain that the *alp wš* is offered to Anat Saphon since in the previous line we read *lyrh š* 'for Yarikh a ram', after which there is a large gap to the right hand edge of the tablet,⁴¹ which seems to indicate that this line contains a god and offering on the same line, with the commencement of a new line for the next deity.

In this text, Anat Saphon is preceded by *yrh* and followed by *pdr*. As pointed out by Milik (1978 136), lines 10-15 of text 1.130 are very similar to text 1.109.16-18, except that in text 1.109 after Anat we find *pdry* whereas in 1.130.15 we find *pdr*.

	<i>KTU</i> 1.130.10f.	<i>KTU</i> 1.109.16f.
10	<i>l b'l u*[grt]</i>	<i>b'l ugrt š</i>
	<i>l b'l hlb*[]</i>	<i>b'l hlb š</i>
	<i>l yrh š []</i> ⁴²	<i>yrh š</i>
	<i>l 'nt špn</i>	<i>'nt špn</i>
	<i>alp w š</i>	<i>alp w š</i>
15	<i>l pdr š</i>	<i>pdry š</i>

Dijkstra (1984 75) restores a final *y* to make the two texts identical, whereas Milik (1978), *TRU* (104) and *TOu2* (217 n.217) accept this as the divine

⁴¹Consult the photograph in Milik (1978 137).

⁴²From the photograph in Milik (1978 137) it is clear that *š* is the end of the written text.

name *pdr*. However, despite the evidence amassed to support the existence of a god *Pidar*⁴³ which I do not dispute, I favour the suggested emendation of Dijkstra to read ‘*Pidray*’ on the basis of 1.109.

5.2.11. RIH 77/10B + 77/22

This small tablet, found in the ‘Palais Nord’ at Ras Ibn Hani during the 1977 season of excavations, is very damaged and has been reconstructed from a number of fragments (Bordreuil and Caquot 1979 299f.). Its opening lines are very similar to text *KTU* 1.90, which helps in its reconstruction. The ritual described by the text appears to be carried out by the king to a statue of the god Reshef and a statue of the goddess Anat. The text of the recto is as follows,

1	[i]d. <i>yph. mlk ršp.</i> <i>h*gb. a[p]. wnpš</i> <i>ksp.wh[rs]. kmm</i> <i>wh ? [alp. w.] š</i>	When the king faces Reshef <i>hgb</i> : ⁴⁴ a <i>ap</i> and <i>npš</i> , silver and gold, ⁴⁵ ditto. And half ⁴⁶ a bull and a ram
5	[lršp]šr[p <i>wšl[m xxx]</i> <i>kst[xxx]l. y/h/z[</i> -----	for Reshef as a <i>šrp</i> -offering and <i>šlmm</i> -offerings a robe ⁴⁷ (?) -----

⁴³See the discussion in *TOu1* (78f.), Milik (1978 136f.), and the existence of personal names with theophoric element *pdr* in Gröndahl (1967 171f.).

⁴⁴Bordreuil and Caquot (1979 300) leave untranslated but refer to *KTU* 1.106 where it may be a grasshopper (cf. hb. *𐤁𐤏𐤍*) or doorman (cf. ar. *hjb* ‘to prevent’). Herdner (1978 28) writing on *KTU* 1.106 suggests the ar. *hājib* ‘guardian of the entrance’. *TOu2* (232) translates “portier”.

⁴⁵Bordreuil and Caquot (1979 300) restore *h[rs]*, but surely they mean *h[rš]* ‘gold’, as in line 10.

⁴⁶Bordreuil and Caquot (1979 300) leave untranslated. Dietrich and Loretz (1981 81) restore *h[z]*, “ein halber Ochse”. *TRU* (352) restores *h[z]*, ‘freccia’ [arrow], appropriate for the archer god. *TOu2* (232 n.257) restores *h[z]*, ‘demi’.

⁴⁷Bordreuil and Caquot (1979 300) leave untranslated. *TRU* (352) “una veste-*kst*”. *TOu2* (233) “un habit?”.

	<i>id. yph. mlk. 'nt</i>	When the king faces Anat
	<i>slh. ap. wnpš. ksp</i>	<i>slh</i> : ⁴⁸ a <i>ap</i> and <i>npš</i> , silver
10	<i>w]hrš. kmm. alp</i>	and gold, ditto. A bull
	<i>wš. šrp. l'nt</i>	and a ram as <i>šrp</i> -offering for Anat,
	<i>]wšlmm</i>	... and <i>šlmm</i> -offerings
Edge		
	<i>k]mm. š l'*n*t*</i>	ditto. A ram for Anat

We can see that a horizontal line was ruled across the tablet after line seven, separating the ritual actions done for Reshef from those done for Anat: the king first faces a statue of Reshef and presents offerings, then he turns to face a statue of Anat and presents very similar offerings to the goddess. This juxtaposition of Reshef and Anat presents us with a cultic event that may express in concrete terms the pairing of these two deities in other texts (1.39 || 1.102, and 1.41.16).

One further text from Ras Ibn Hani (78/04) may contain a reference to Anat in line 8 of the recto which reads *]nt.ap.[* (Bordreuil and Caquot 1980 354, *TOu2* 234) and translated 'Anat an *ap*'.

5.2.12. RS 20.123+

We have already discussed this polyglot vocabulary above, and noted that Anat occurs in the list (line IVb.12) in the form *a]-na-tum*, identical to that of text RS 20.24. Here, Anat is preceded by Gatharu and followed by Gatharu and Shapshu. As I noted above, this grouping of deities recalls text 1.43.

⁴⁸Bordreuil and Caquot (1979 300f.) point out that *slh* is a place name, found in the toponym list RIH 77/27.10, and they believe this text enables us to restore *KTU* 1.46.1 as '*n]t slh*. *TRU* (352) and *TOu2* (233) also accept this as a toponym.

5.2.13. Hurrian Texts

The strength of the position of Anat at Ugarit was such that she was introduced into the 'Hurrian' pantheon of Ugarit along with other local west Semitic deities: El, Dadmish and Reshef (Laroche 1968 518f.). In text *KTU* 1.42, Anat appears in thirteenth position among a list of 17 deities. She is immediately preceded by *tmg* (= šimegi = the sun) and *iršp* (= iršappa = Reshef), and followed by *ibnkl pdgl* (= Eb Nikkal Pandigalli = ? Nikkal and Lady of the palace) then *ndgb* (= nubadig = Nubadig).

In texts *KTU* 1.135 (= 1.26 = 1.60), and 1.116, we find Anat ('*ntd*')⁴⁹ in an almost identical sequence of deities in which she is preceded by the god *hmn*⁵⁰ and followed by Shimegi (= the sun). In the comparative table of Laroche (1968 519) we can see that the order of the deities is fairly fixed, including the section with Anat, until we get to Ḫebat, after which the order becomes a little confused. Text 1.110 differs more substantially from the other two lists, but again we find Anat followed by Shimegi. In text RS 20.123+.IV.a.18 and IV.b.14 we find Hurrian Shimegi equated with Sumerian UTU and Ugaritic Shapshu, and in the second instance, we find Shapshu following very close to Anat, with only Gatharu intervening, which recalls the grouping of Anat, Shapshu, Yarikh and Gatharu in *KTU* 1.43, and the group Anat, Gatharu and Shapshu in RS 20.123+.

⁴⁹The final *d* on the divine name 'Anat' is the Hurrian dative suffix (syll. *-da*) which corresponds to the Ugaritic preposition *l-* (Laroche 1968 531).

⁵⁰*KTU* 1.116 adds Nubadig before Anat. Oldenburg (1969 88) believes that Anat's presence directly after *hmn*, who is a storm god, is indicative of her close association with storm gods in general, but evidence from other Hurrian texts shows that the connection between these is limited to the present text.

5.3. DISCUSSION

It is clear from the many contexts in which we find the goddess Anat in these cultic texts that she played a full part in the Ugaritic cult, and was even influential enough to hold a position in the 'Hurrian' pantheon worshipped at Ugarit. However, she does not appear to be treated in any special way, or to be any more prominent than the majority of deities we find mentioned in cultic texts.

Having reviewed the cultic texts in which we find the goddess Anat, we may now turn to an examination of the position of the goddess in the cultic context. We will begin with a comparison of the offerings presented to Anat, and those presented to other deities within each text. We shall begin with text 1.39.

1.39.4-8					
[i]l* <i>h</i>	<i>dqtm</i>				
<i>ilhm</i>		<i>alp w š</i>			
<i>ilhm</i>			<i>gdlt</i>		
[b]* <i>l</i>				š	
<i>atrt</i>				š	
<i>tkmn w šnm</i>				š	
* <i>nt</i>				š	
<i>ršp</i>				š	
<i>dr il w p*[h]r b'l</i>			<i>gdlt</i>		
<i>šlm</i>			<i>gdlt</i>		
1.39.13f.					
<i>il b*t</i>			<i>gdlt</i>		
<i>ušhry</i>			<i>gdlt</i>		
<i>ym</i>			<i>gdlt</i>		
<i>b'l</i>			<i>gdlt</i>		
<i>yrh</i>			<i>gdlt</i>		
<i>ktr</i>			<i>gdlt</i>		
<i>trmn</i>			<i>gdlt</i>		
<i>pdry</i>			<i>gdlt</i>		
<i>dqt</i>	<i>dqt</i>				
<i>trt</i>	<i>dqt</i>				
[rš]p * <i>nt hby</i>					<i>dbhm</i>

š[p]š pgr			[gd]lt		
iltm hnqtm	dq*tm				
[y]r*h kty			gdlt		
šlmt				š	

As we can see from the above table, we find Anat in two different sequences of deities. In the first, she receives a ram (š) along with four other deities which form a group of five. She does not appear to be treated any differently from the other deities. In the second sequence, we have the divine name 'nt h**b**ly (discussed above) which comes directly after Reshef who does not receive an offering of his own and who is most probably to be grouped together with Anat h**b**ly. We can see in this second sequence that the dominating offering is a cow (gdlt) although the deified 'Ewe' (dq**t**) along with trt and the 'two strangling goddesses' are offered ewes. However, for ršp 'nt h**b**ly we are told that they receive 'two sacrifices' (db**h**m: dual). What these sacrifices are we are not told, nor do we find this term again in connection with Anat.

Moving to 1.41 (|| 1.87) we find that Anat may be offered two ewes (dq**t**m) and a town-pigeon (ynt qrt) in line 9f. if we accept the reconstruction of the text (discussed above). However, this must remain uncertain given the high degree of damage suffered by both texts at this point. We can be certain that Anat is included in the sequence beginning at line 13.

1.41.14f. and 1.87					
ilh			[dq t m]		
[il]hm	alp				š
[ilhm]		g*d*[lt]			
b'l*					š
atrt					[š]
[tk]m*n* w*[šnm]					[š]
'nt					š
r*šp					š
[dr il w p h r b'l]		gdlt			
šlm*		[gdlt]			

Once again we find the simple divine name ‘Anat’ and here she is offered a ram (š) along with four other deities. This sequence of five deities is identical to that in 1.39.4f. and in fact, text 1.41.12-19 appears to be a duplicate of text 1.39.3-9.

In text 1.43 we have a slightly different situation in that only four gods are involved (see discussion above); Shapshu and Yarikh are both ‘strong ones’ (*gtr*), and each is offered a shekel of gold. Gatharu, the eponymous chief of the *gtrm*, is first offered one shekel of good silver, then two shekels of good silver, and each time appears to be accompanied by Anat.

1.43.9f.			
<i>špš w yrḥ</i>	<i>tql ḥrṣ</i>		
<i>gtr</i> (Shapshu?)		<i>tql ksp ṭb</i>	
<i>*nth*</i>			<i>ap* w* np*š</i>
<i>špš[w y]rḥ</i>	<i>tql ḥrṣ</i>		
<i>gtr tn</i>		<i>[tql ksp] ṭb</i>	
<i>['nth]</i>			<i>ap w npš</i>

From the above table it is obvious that the ritual is highly structured, and can be divided into two basic parts: the first addressed to Shapshu, Yarikh, Gatharu and Anat, and the second almost identical except that Gatharu is offered two shekels of good silver. We can only assume that Anat should be restored in line 16 on the basis of symmetry although we cannot be certain of this. In this ritual the *gtrm* are offered precious metals but Anat is offered parts of a sacrificial victim. Why this should be the case can only be guessed; if we turn to the ritual described in RIH 77/10B+ we find that Reshef and Anat are offered sacrificial offerings in the form of *ap w npš*, a bull (*alp*) and a ram (š), and moreover, both are offered silver (*ksp*) and gold (*ḥrṣ*).⁵¹ There is a similarity between these two texts in the sense that each ritual

⁵¹A mythic counterpart to this kind of offering is seen in *KTU* 1.14.iv.31f. where Keret visited the sanctuary of Athirat of the Two Tyres and vowed to her silver (emending *wsp* to *ksp*) and gold (*ḥrṣ*), although we need not define texts 1.43 or RIH 77/10B+ as vows (Wiggins 1993 21f.).

can be seen as two parts and that each part is identically structured, as well as the similarity of offerings, although we would not press our observation beyond this. Perhaps the actions described in each text were addressing similar cultic concerns, and perhaps the relationship existing between Gatharu and Anat, and Reshef and Anat is in some way similar, in which case we should perhaps see in Reshef a deity that may have had links with the *gtrm*. However, there is no evidence to support this theory.

Text 1.46 is very fragmentary but we find two sequences of deities in which Anat appears.

1.46.3f.				
...				š
il				š
b'l				š
dgn				š*
...				
['t]t*r w *t*tpl			gdlt	
š*pn		dqt		
...				
*n*t*			gdlt	
1.46.17				
[ilib]			[gdlt]	
[il]				[š]
[b]*[l]				š*
'nt špn	[alp]			[š]

In the first sequence we find several offerings of rams to various gods, then after a lacuna we find a cow (*gdlt*) offered to the binomial god *'ttr w 'tpl* and a ewe offered to Saphon. After another lacuna we find the divine name Anat alongside the offering of a cow. However, we should not be tempted to link Anat and *'ttr w 'tpl* on the basis that they receive the same offering because the intervening lacunae obscure any sequence of deities or offerings that may have been apparent. In the second sequence we find the name Anat Saphon but unfortunately the offering is lost

to us. However, the fact that 1.46.10bf. is a duplicate of 1.109.1f. enables us to restore the offering as a bull and a ram (*alp w š*).

Text 1.109 presents us with several mentions of Anat in the context of the ritual presentation of offerings.

1.109.11f.				
<i>ilib</i>		<i>gdlt</i>		
<i>il</i>				<i>š</i>
<i>b'l</i>				<i>š</i>
<i>'nt špn</i>	<i>alp</i>			<i>š</i>
<i>pdry</i>				<i>š</i>
1.109.15f.				
<i>ilib</i>				<i>š</i>
<i>b'l ugrt</i>				<i>š</i>
<i>b'l hlb</i>				<i>š</i>
<i>yrh</i>				<i>š</i>
<i>'nt špn</i>	<i>alp</i>			<i>š</i>
<i>pdry</i>				<i>š</i>
<i>ddmš</i>				<i>š</i>
1.109.19f.				
<i>ilib</i>				<i>š</i>
<i>b'l</i>	<i>alp</i>			<i>š</i>
<i>dgn</i>				<i>š</i>
<i>il t'dr</i>				<i>š</i>
<i>b'l</i>				<i>š</i>
<i>'nt</i>				<i>š</i>
<i>ršp</i>				<i>š</i>
1.109.24f.				
<i>il</i>				<i>š</i>
<i>'nt hš</i>				<i>tn šm</i>
<i>gtrm</i>			<i>ğšb šmal d alpm</i>	
1.109.32f.				
<i>b'l špn</i>		<i>gdlt</i>		
<i>i*l bt</i>				
<i>špn</i>				
<i>b*'l ug*[rt]</i>				<i>š</i>
<i>ilib</i>				[<i>š</i>]
<i>b'l* ugrt*</i>		<i>gd*l*t*</i>		
<i>**n*t špn*</i>				

In the first sequence (a duplicate of text 1.46) the god *ilib* is offered a cow, then every other deity is given a ram. However, Anat Saphon is presented with a bull and a ram (*alp w š*) and is the only deity in this sequence to receive two offerings. In the second sequence again we find Anat Saphon, and again she is offered both a bull and a ram whereas all the other deities receive a single ram (a sequence duplicated in 1.130.10f.). In the third sequence we find Anat, offered a ram along with seven other deities. However, in this sequence Baal is offered a bull and a ram. In the fourth sequence we find El presented with a ram, Anat *hlš* presented with two rams, and the *gtrm* presented with the ‘left *šsb* of two bulls’ (see above discussion). The dual offering to *gtrm* and the two rams offered to Anat recall the ritual recorded in *KTU* 1.43. The final sequence in which Anat is included is fragmentary and ends with ‘*nt špn* without naming the offering, although if we were to follow the example of previous sequences in this text, the offering would be *alp w š*.

In text 1.130 we find a reference to Anat Saphon in line 13. Beginning at line 10 where the text becomes more readable we have the following sequence.

1.130.10f.		
<i>b'l u*[grt]</i>		
<i>b'l hlb*</i>		
<i>yrh</i>		<i>š</i>
<i>'nt špn</i>	<i>alp</i>	<i>š</i>
<i>pdr</i>		<i>š</i>

As stated in the above discussion, this sequence (not the text) is duplicated in 1.109.16f. except that in line 15 we have *pdr* rather than *pdry*, and the 1.130 sequence is missing *ddmš* at the end. Because of the differences between the two texts it is unlikely that one is a copy of the other, although both appear to rely on the existence of an established sequence of deities which could be drawn on for different cultic acts. However, such sequences appear to have included the number and type of offering dedicated to each deity since it appears that the deities in

1.109.16f. and 1.130.10f. were offered exactly the same offerings in each case. Therefore, we find that 'nt špn is offered a bull and a ram (alp w š) in both texts.

We saw above that text 1.148 copies the sequence of *KTU* 1.47, 1.118 and RS 20.24. However, 1.148 is an offering list whereas the others are simply deity lists.

1.148.1-9		
[ilib]	[alp]	[š]
il	[alp]	[š]
[dgn]	alp	š*
[b'l špn]	[alp]	[š]
b'lm	[alp]	[š]
[b'lm]	alp	š
b'lm	[alp]	[š]
[b]*l*[m]	alp	š
[b'lm]	a*l*[p]	[š]
arš w šmm	[alp]	š*
kt*r*[t]		š
yrh*		š*
špn		[š]
ktr		š
pdry		š
šrm w* *m*[q]t		š
atrt		š
'nt		š
špš		š
aršy		š
'ttrt		š
ušhry		š
il t'dr b'l*		š
ršp		š
ddmš		š
pḥr ilm		š*
ym		š
k*nr		š

This text has been restored according to the parallel deity lists. However, we can be fairly certain from what remains that the gods from *ilib* to the end of the

five *b'lm* are all offered 'a bull and a ram' (*alp w š*). After that, all the deities are offered rams (*š*); in this, Anat is treated no differently.

The final text that presents us with an offering dedicated to Anat is RIH 77/10B+. This text appears to be concerned with a ritual involving Reshef and Anat, who are presented offerings by the king.

RIH 77/10B+

<i>ršp ḥgb</i>	<i>a[p]</i>	<i>npš</i>	<i>ksp</i>	<i>ḥ[rš]</i>	<i>[alp]</i> ⁵²	<i>š</i>	<i>kst (?)</i>
<i>'nt slḥ</i>	<i>ap</i>	<i>npš</i>	<i>ksp</i>	<i>ḥrš</i>	<i>alp</i>	<i>š</i>	<i>š</i>

As we can see, both Reshef and Anat receive almost identical offerings, although those offered to Reshef have been partially restored by a comparison with those offered to Anat, in which case we should be slightly more cautious. The fact that before the lacuna in which *[alp]* is restored in Reshef's part of the list we find a *ḥ* whereas we do not find it in the Anat part of the list should alert us to the fact that some differences did exist between these two parts of the ritual, although the poor state of preservation of the text means we are unable to be certain what this might have been. The interesting fact of the ritual is that it is the only text in which Anat is offered precious metals, even though in text 1.43 the other gods involved receive silver and gold and 'good silver' (*ksp ṭb*).

We are now in a position to be able to summarise our results. In the following table, only the references to Anat herself are presented.

⁵²Before the lacuna is a *ḥ* which could be *ḥz* 'half', or 'arrow'; see discussion above.

Text	'nt	ršp 'nt ḥbly	'nth*	'nt špn	'nt ḥlš
1.39.7	š				
1.39.17		dbḥm			
1.41.16	š				
1.43.13			ap* w* np*š		
1.43.16			ap w npš		
1.46.5	gdlt				
1.46.17				?	
1.87.17	[š]				
1.109.13				alp w š	
1.109.17				alp w š	
1.109.22	š				
1.109.25					tn šm
1.109.36				?	
1.130.13				alp w š	
1.148.7	š				

The data in the above table may be misleading. For example, if we look down the column under 'nt špn we find three occurrences of *alp w š* and one restored, which could be interpreted as a strong tradition in Ugaritic cultic practice to offer Anat Saphon a bull and a ram. However, once we realise that 1.46.17 is restored from 1.109.13 and that 1.109.17 and 1.130.13 are based on an identical sequence of deities and offerings, we are reduced to only two independent lists in which Anat Saphon is offered a bull and ram. In order to avoid such confusion it is better to work with 'underlying' sequences, i.e., what appears to be the common basis between certain written texts with which we have dealt.

It is not within the scope of this thesis to undertake a complete examination of all the cultic texts, nor to establish a relative order among all the deities found in them.⁵³ The following discussion includes only those texts in which

⁵³For a recent discussion of this area see Del Olmo Lete (1992a).

we find Anat. In the table below, each of the five columns represents a sequence of deities that is repeated in more than one text.

A ⁵⁴	B	C	D	E
<i>ilib</i>	<i>ilh</i>	<i>ilib</i>	<i>ilib</i>	<i>il bt</i>
<i>il</i>	<i>ilhm</i>		<i>il</i>	<i>ušhry</i>
<i>dgn</i>	<i>ilhm</i>			<i>ym.b'l</i>
<i>b'l špn</i>	<i>b'l</i>	<i>b'l ugrt</i>	<i>b'l</i>	<i>yrh</i>
<i>b'lm</i>		<i>b'l hlb</i>		<i>ktr</i>
<i>b'lm</i>				<i>trmn</i>
<i>b'lm</i>				<i>pdry</i>
<i>b'lm</i>				<i>dqt</i>
<i>b'lm</i>				<i>trt</i>
<i>b'lm</i>				<i>ršp</i>
<i>arš w šmm</i>				<i>'nt hbyl</i>
<i>ktrt</i>				<i>špš pgr</i>
<i>yrh</i>		<i>yrh</i>		<i>iltm hnqtm</i>
<i>špn</i>				<i>yrh kty</i>
<i>ktr</i>				
<i>pdry</i>				
<i>'ttr</i>				
<i>grm w 'mqt</i>				
<i>atrt</i>	<i>atrt</i>			
	<i>tkmn w šnm</i>			
<i>'nt</i>	<i>'nt</i>	<i>'nt špn</i>	<i>'nt špn</i>	
<i>špš</i>		<i>pdry</i>	<i>pdry</i>	
<i>aršy</i>				
<i>ušhry</i>				
<i>'ttrt</i>				
<i>il t'dr b'l</i>				
<i>ršp</i>	<i>ršp</i>			
<i>ddmš</i>		<i>ddmš</i>		
<i>pḥr ilm</i>	<i>dr il w pḥr b'l</i>			
<i>ym</i>				
<i>uḥt</i>				
<i>knr</i>				
<i>mlkm</i>				
<i>šlm</i>	<i>šlm</i>			

⁵⁴The labels A-E represent the following texts:

A: 1.118, RS 20.24, 1.148, 1.47; B: 1.39.5f, 1.41.14f, 1.87.15f.; C: 1.109.15f, 1.130.10f.; D: 1.46.17, 1.109.11f.; E: 1.39.13f, 1.102.1f.

As we can see, sequence A is by far the longest list of deities and its importance can be seen in the fact that it was translated into Akkadian (RS 20.24). In this list, Anat appears in second place among a list of six goddesses: *atrt* - 'nt - *špš* - *aršy* - *ušhry* - 'ttrt. Since this is the longest of the sequences it will be taken as a basis for comparison with the others.

Sequence B is much shorter. It begins with the sequence *ilh* - *ilhm* - *ilhm* unlike A which has *ilib* - *il* - *dgn*. We could argue that the form *ilhm* is used as a singular (cf. the use of hb. 𐤀𐤋𐤍), and that each of these three gods corresponds to the first three of list A, using the noun 'god' rather than their proper names. However, Levine and de Tarragon (1993 104) point out that although the plural *ilhm* ('gods' = DINGIR.MEŠ) is a generic term frequently used in cultic ceremonies throughout the near east, the singular term *ilh* in text 1.41 and 1.39 probably refers to El as the 'presiding deity'. If this is the case then we have El as the first deity followed by two offerings to 'the gods'. The B sequence continues with *b'l* where A has the specific *b'l špn* and list of six *b'lm*, and then we find the sequence *atrt* - *tkmn w šnm* - 'nt. The relative ordering of Athirat followed by Anat is the same as A, but between them we find the binomial *tkmn w šnm* which does not appear in A at all. Continuing with the sequence, we find Reshef which follows Anat in A, then 'the generation of El and the assembly of Baal' (*dr il w pḥr b'l*), which appears to be a longer form of *pḥr ilm*, which probably encompasses both these 'assemblies', and which is found in A after Reshef. Finally we find *šlm* which is also the final deity in sequence A. Despite the differences at the beginning of B, and the appearance of a deity between Athirat and Anat who is absent from A, the relative sequence of *b'l* - *atrt* - 'nt - *ršp* - *pḥr ilm/b'l* - *šlm* is substantial enough to suggest that sequence B may have been partially based on that of A, or at least that the author of B was influenced in part by A.

Sequence C is even shorter than that of B with only seven deities in total. C begins with *ilib* as does A, and then we find *b'l ugrt* - *b'l ḥlb* which has obvious

similarities with the *b'l špn - b'lm* (x6) of A. Perhaps C makes explicit some of the names hidden behind the *b'lm* of list A? C continues with the sequence *yrḥ - 'nt špn - pdry - ddmš*. The fact that we have Anat Saphon rather than Anat does not obscure our observation that this sequence is similar to the relative order of these deities in A, with one difference: in A, *pdry* comes before Anat whereas in C it comes after. The sequence of C is even closer to A in terms of the relative order of the deities than is B, and we conclude that C is based on or influenced by the order of the gods set out in A.

Sequence D is very similar to that of C, although again there are differences. D begins with *ilib - il*, exactly the same as A and adding *il* which is lacking from the beginning of C. Then comes *b'l*, which is less specific than the list of either A or C. We then find *'nt špn - pdry* which is identical to C. Again we can see that the relative order of the deities in D has close affinities with A, but that the sequence of *'nt špn - pdry* echoes that of C. The sequence C is found in *KTU* 1.109.15f. and 1.130.10f. If we believe that the relative order of deities in C was based on that of A, then the sequence *'nt špn - pdry* in C is either a deliberate reversal of the relative order in A, or a mistake on the part of the author of one of these texts who was then followed by the author of the second. The question is which came first, 1.109.15 or 1.130.10f.? Sequence D appears to draw on the relative order of A but follows the reversal in order of *'nt špn - pdry* as we find in C. Sequence D is found in 1.46.17 and 1.109.11f. In my opinion it is probable that the switch in relative order occurred in 1.109.11f. and was repeated by the same scribe in 1.109.15f. The authors of 1.39.5f. and 1.46.17 followed text 1.109 rather than the sequence A and accepted the relative order *'nt špn - pdry* over against A's *pdry - 'nt*.

In the primary sequence (A) Anat is second in a group of six goddesses; she is preceded by Athirat and followed by Shapshu. B appears to be loosely based on A but here we find the insertion of the pair *tkmn w šnm* between Athirat and Anat.

Furthermore, because the intervening deities are not included, Anat is now followed by Reshef. The author of 1.109 was influenced in his composition by the important sequence A. However, in 11f. (D) he reversed the relative order of Pidray and Anat, and repeated this reversal in C (15f.): the sequence of 1.109.11f. was then copied in 1.46.17 and that of 1.109.15f. was copied in 1.130.10f. Sequence E which we find in 1.39.13f. and 1.102.1f. does not seem to be based on that of A. Here, Anat in the form of *'nt ḥbly* is preceded by Reshef, and these two appear to share the same offering (*dbḥm*), and Anat is followed by Shapshu-*pgr*.⁵⁵

The above discussion focused attention on those sequences of deities which we found to be copied in more than one text. What follows are the remaining sequences which are only found in one text, although we cannot assume them to be one off creations since by no stretch of the imagination do we have all the cultic texts produced at Ugarit for comparison.

F 1.43.9f.	G 1.46.3f.	H 1.109.19f.	I 1.109.24f.	J 1.109.32f.	K RIH 77/10B+
<i>\$pš w yrḥ</i>	...	<i>ilib</i>	<i>il</i>	<i>b'l špn</i>	<i>ršp ḥgb</i>
<i>gtr</i>	<i>il</i>	<i>b'l</i>	<i>'nt ḥlš</i>	<i>il bt</i>	<i>'nt slḥ</i>
<i>'nth</i>	<i>b'l</i>	<i>dgn</i>	<i>gtrm</i>	<i>špn</i>	
<i>\$pš w yrḥ</i>	<i>dgn</i>	<i>il t'dr</i>		<i>b'l ugrt</i>	
<i>gtr</i>	...	<i>b'l</i>		<i>ilib</i>	
<i>'nth</i>	<i>'ttr w 'ttpl</i>	<i>'nt</i>		<i>b'l ugrt</i>	
	<i>špn</i>	<i>ršp</i>		<i>'nt špn</i>	
	...				
	<i>'nt</i>				

⁵⁵See the discussion above on this grouping of deities.

L
RS 20.123+
... b]a(?) -ti[]
pa-ad(?) -r]i-ya-m[a(?)]
.(.) m]u-te-ma
aš(?) -r]a-tum
.]? -ra-tum
da-ad]-mi-šu
[. . a]l(?) ni-nu-wa
[ga(?) -]ša(?) -ru
a]-na-tum
g[a]-ša-ru
š[a]-ap-šu
a-i a-ku
aš-ta-ru
ba-a-lu
da-ad-mi-šu]

As we can see, none of the remaining sequences appears to be based on any of the sequences A-E, and any appearance of traces of sequence A such as *b'l* - 'nt - ršp in H are probably more due to accident rather than having any significance.

In F we find Anat associated with the two *gtrm* Shapshu and Yarikh, and with the chief of the *gtrm*, Gatharu. G is fragmentary and we are unable to be certain what deities are associated with her. In H, Anat is preceded by Baal and followed by Reshef. The short sequence I sees Anat *hlš* associated with El and the *gtrm*. J places Baal in the form of Baal Ugarit before Anat Saphon. K is the text from Ras Ibn Hani in which we find Anat *slh* treated in exactly the same way as Reshef *hgb* who precedes her. For comparison, L is the sequence found in the polyglot vocabulary RS 20.123+. Here, Anat is preceded and followed by Gatharu, after whom comes Shapshu.

Returning to our original question of what offerings were dedicated to Anat in the cultic texts, we are now in a position to be able to assess the evidence for the based on *sequences* of deities rather than texts.

Text	'nt	ršp 'nt ḥbly	'nth*	'nt špn	'nt ḥlš
A	š				
B	š				
C				alp w š	
D				alp w š	
E		dbḥm			
F			ap w npš		
G	gdlt				
H	š				
I					tn šm
J				?	

This table presents us with a different picture to the one based on texts above. We could modify it further since in our discussion we have seen that B is actually based on A, and that C and D are also linked. Taking that into account, we can see that when we have the simple divine name 'nt, two separate sequences tell us she is presented with a ram (š) and one sequence presents her with a cow (gdlt). For 'nt ḥbly we see that she only appears in E and there she is linked to Reshef, both of whom are offered the joint dbḥm. For the column 'nth we have concluded above that this is likely to mean 'his (Gatharu's) Anat', in which case this is another instance of the simple divine name 'nt with pronominal suffix. This only occurs in sequence F and here she is offered ap w npš in contrast to the other deities who are offered precious metals. For Anat Saphon we find her in sequences C, D and J. As we have stated above, C and D are linked, in which case we only have two independent sequences in which she occurs. In C/D she is offered a bull and a ram (alp w š) but damage to the text in J makes it impossible to determine what she was offered there. In the absence of our comparison of sequences we might have suggested to restore alp w š, but since we have only one independent sequence to support this we have no firm basis for such a restoration. Finally we come to Anat ḥlš who appears only in I, and to whom two rams are offered. Sequence K (see above) is something of a special case in that Anat slh is offered the same as Reshef ḥgb in a two part ceremony. Here, Anat is offered precious metal as well as animal sacrifice.

5.4. CONCLUSIONS

The number of cultic texts in which we find Anat indicates that she was actively worshipped in the Ugaritic cult, sometimes as a goddess within a list of other deities, and at other times as a major participant in particular ceremonies. I cannot agree with claims such as Oldenburg's (1969 90), that Anat is seldom mentioned in the cultic texts. He writes,

This seems to show a great decline in her function as a fertility goddess already at a early time. That function of hers has gradually been taken over by Baal... This is the reward for all her unselfish service to Baal.

However, as we have seen from our discussion above, Anat is present in many cultic texts, and is included within sequence A which was used as a basis for the order of deities in a proportion of the cultic texts that we have studied. Within this sequence there is absolutely no indication that she is any less important than any of the other deities included. Oldenburg's claim that Anat's function as a fertility goddess was waning in favour of Baal puts an interpretation on the mythic texts I find hard to accept: I see little evidence that her *function* was as a fertility goddess.

In our discussion of the offerings presented to Anat in her various forms, we found that she was always the recipient of animal sacrifices except for K where she receives duplicates of the offerings presented to Reshef which included precious metals. We also observed that when we dealt with the underlying sequences of deities rather than with individual texts, no particular pattern of offering emerged. We cannot say that Anat was always offered a ram or a cow or some other combination since she appears to have been offered a broad spectrum of different things. The offerings with which she is presented do not distinguish the goddess from other deities since they are the kinds of offerings which are presentable to many of the other deities worshipped in the Ugaritic cult. However, we should not be blind to the fact that the texts we now

have represent only a small proportion of texts that were composed, and even within the existing corpus of evidence, the frequent lacunae make it impossible to come to any certain conclusions based on the comparison of texts. There were probably many more cultic texts than we now have which included Anat as part of the ceremonies, and although the conclusions we arrive at concerning the place of Anat in the Ugaritic cult must be based on the evidence we have to hand, we must not forget the incomplete nature of the evidence. In other words, any trends that may have been present in Ugaritic cultic practise concerning Anat may now be obscured by the lack of data.

Turning our attention to the other deities with whom she is associated we are now in a position to see a pattern emerging. The fact that she sometimes appears alongside Baal is not surprising given her relationship with him witnessed in the mythical texts. However, if we were expecting the cultic texts to reflect the theological situation found in the myths then it is surprising to find that this association is weak. We find Anat following directly after Baal in sequences C and D, although we have seen above that these two are dependant upon each other and cannot be taken as independent traditions linking Baal and Anat. She also follows Baal in H and J, both sequences found in text 1.109. We find no texts in which Anat plays a major role alongside Baal as we do for Anat and Gatharu (1.43) or Anat and Reshef (RIH 77/10B+).

Within these texts we find an association between Anat and Reshef. In B Anat is directly followed by Reshef but this may simply be a result of the selection of deities from sequence A. A much stronger connection is seen in E where we find Reshef linked with Anat *hblly* through the joint offering of *dbhm*. We find Reshef following immediately after Anat in H, but again a strong connection between these two deities is seen in K where a ceremony in two parts is directed first at Reshef and

second at Anat, with a strong correlation between the offerings presented to each. In the Hurrian texts we found that Anat is preceded by Reshef (*iršp*) in *KTU* 1.42.

A further connection, that between Anat and the *gtrm* may also have played a role in the Ugaritic cult. In F we found that two of the *gtrm* are named as Shapshu and Yarikh, and furthermore, that Gatharu, the eponymous chief of this group, appears and offerings are presented to him and to *his Anat*. In sequence I we found that offerings are presented to El, Anat *hlš* and to the group *gtrm*, reinforcing this connection between the goddess and this group. Although the evidence of *KTU* 1.108.6 is not as clear, it too may support the thesis of a link between Anat and Gatharu/*gtrm* if we accept that *gtr* here is the divine name Gatharu. In the Akkadian list RS 20.123+ we also found that Anat is preceded and followed by Gatharu.

We have already noted that in *KTU* 1.43 Shapshu and Yarikh appear to be named as two *gtrm* and the sequences we have discussed often portray Anat alongside Shapshu. In C we found that Yarikh preceded Anat, but this is the only example outside F and may not be significant. However, a much stronger tie between Anat and Shapshu can be demonstrated. In sequence A, Shapshu immediately follows Anat and in sequence E we find Shapshu *pgr* immediately after Anat *hbly*. In the Akkadian list (L) we have already seen that Anat is preceded and followed by Gatharu, but after Gatharu we find Shapshu, and in the Hurrian pantheon lists we find Anat either preceded or followed by the Hurrian equivalent of Shapshu (*tmg* = šimegi). We have already discussed the underworld characteristic of Shapshu, and the group *gtrm* along with Gatharu, are generally assumed to share this infernal character. We therefore conclude that Anat herself was considered, at least for the purposes of the cult, as a goddess with links with the underworld; a conclusion that does not strike as too outlandish considering her accepted characteristic as a warrior goddess - with its inevitable consequences, and her burial of Baal's body in tablet 1.6. This is reflected by her presence in the group of deities in E, Reshef - Anat 'destroyer' - Shapshu *pgr* -

the two strangling goddesses (see above discussion), all of whom reinforce the conclusion that Anat was seen to be a goddess involved with the realm of the dead, at least in the cultic texts.

The correspondence between what we read in Ugaritic myth and what we see in Ugaritic cultic texts is surprisingly limited. We have seen that the cultic texts have only the smallest recognition of the strong bonds between Anat and Baal described in the myths. Furthermore, the occasional pairing of Anat and Athtart, both in Ugaritic and Egyptian myth, is never repeated in the cultic texts. On the other hand, the web of links between Anat, Reshef, Gatharu, Shapshu and Yarikh are not immediately apparent in the myths. However, once we recognise these connections in the cultic texts, we begin to see some clues to them in the myths. For example, in *KTU* 1.6.i we find that Anat and Shapshu go down together into the underworld to fetch the body of Baal, whilst in *KTU* 1.17.vi Anat offers to make Aqhat immortal which is probably to be taken to mean Aqhat's inclusion in the cult of the dead kings. As well as playing a role in the underworld, the *gtrm* are also astral in character (Sun and Moon), and perhaps the same could be said for Anat in as much as she flies in the heavens (cf. *KTU* 1.10.ii.10f., 1.18.iv, 1.108.8), and is called the 'mistress of heaven' in *KTU* 1.108.7 (*b'lt.\$mm.rmm*), and often in Egypt.⁵⁶

The discrepancy between cultic and mythic texts could be explained in a number of ways. On the one hand we might suggest that myths reflect an older level in Ugaritic thought handed down between generations by tradition, whereas cultic texts reflect the practises of the 'modern' cult. On the other hand we could argue that by its very nature, oral composition is a process that continually keeps a tradition alive

⁵⁶For example, compare the statuary groups Anat and Ramesses II (seated), Anat and Ramesses II (standing), Anat and Ramesses II (Brooklyn Museum 54.67), and the British Museum Stele 646/191. See my chapter on Anat in Egypt.

and relevant, and therefore is influenced by 'modern' thought, whereas there is a strong tendency in cultic practise for a rigid adherence to a set of rules that are carried out regardless of whether they are any longer fully understood. Whatever the reason for the dichotomy between mythic and cultic theology, we can see from the above discussion that the Anat of the cultic texts has both continuity and discontinuity with the Anat we found in the mythic texts. Alliances of Anat with other groups of deities in the cultic texts are not found in mythic texts and *vice versa*, but perhaps this should not be surprising since the two genres are concerned with alternative yet complimentary aspects of theology. As De Tarragon (*TOu2* 129) writes,

Ces listes d'offrandes sont le meilleur témoignage d'un panthéon cultuel
qui diffère parfois du panthéon de la littérature mythologique.

CONCLUSIONS

Our survey of the evidence for the goddess Anat in the second millennium B.C. has ranged far and wide; from 18th century Mari, to Egypt of a slightly later period down to the New Kingdom, and finally to Ugarit, with a minor detour into sixth and fifth century Elephantine for good measure!

We looked first at the evidence from 18th century Mari, where we found evidence for a cult centre of the goddess at Bīt Ḥanat approximately 75 miles downstream from Mari. Here, King Zimrilim took part in an oath ceremony which also included Anat as the chief deity of the city. At Mari itself we found references to Anat in various administrative texts, but there was no evidence to suggest that she played any significant role or held any special place of honour in the Mari cult. A survey of theophoric names in which she is an element showed that she had the kinds of relationships with her human devotees that one would expect to find for many other deities. Therefore, very little can be gleaned about her character from this very early period of her history beyond mere generalities. However, we were able to conclude that she was originally a West Semitic goddess, probably introduced to Mari as an integral part of Amorite theology.

A comparison of the personal names which come from Mari with those found later at Ugarit revealed a certain continuity between them, although this was probably the result of the way in which onomastics function, tending to be conservative, especially in the relationships predicated between human and deity. As for the various etymologies proposed for her name, we found that it is impossible to suggest an etymology with any degree of certainty simply because of the antiquity of her history and the nature of the texts. However, it was probably the case that for the people of Ugarit also, the origins of her name were equally confusing, and most likely many conflicting etymologies could have been applied to her name on the basis of aural similitude, puns, etc.

Early material from Egypt, coming from a slightly later date than that of Mari, supports the presence of a cult of Anat among the West Semites seen in some of the slave names of the Brooklyn papyrus 35.1446. However, it was not until the 19th dynasty that Anat appears to have been adopted by the royal household, and more especially under Ramesses II. Anat was admitted into the Egyptian pantheon structure and played a part in Egyptian myth and magic rituals, along with Astarte and Qedeset. Anat appears to have been especially favoured by Ramesses II since we find several monuments which show this pair seated or standing together. Anat is 'mistress of heaven' and mother of the king, whilst the king is her son and her suckling. However, the most prominent feature of Anat's character in Egypt was as a warrior goddess. In Egypt we find swords, dogs, and parts of war chariots named after Anat, and in the column from Heliopolis we find the goddess handing over a weapon to the king so that he might destroy his enemies.

From Ugarit we find a wealth of material bearing on the character of Anat. Although we found that it is very difficult to discern anything assured from her titles, the mythic texts offer us detailed information unrivalled from elsewhere. In the Baal Cycle, we found that her role was essentially that of mediator between Baal and El. We were also able to discern that she was considered a formidable warrior goddess, although for text 1.3.ii, we did not accept the view that sees it as the expression of a ritual function linked to Baal's fertilising rains. However, in the Baal Cycle, this warrior aspect of her character was subjugated to the narrative plot which used Anat as a mediator between her brother and her father, although it was still brought out in passages such as 1.3.ii, 1.3.iii and her threats to El and his family.

In the Aqhat narrative we saw that her character had been allowed to develop more freely, and we witnessed her plotting to murder Aqhat; the plan was that he was to die like quarry at the hands of the huntress. Anat as a huntress is her dominating feature in this narrative; the dispute between Anat and Aqhat revolves

around a composite bow which, as well as being a weapon of war, is also a prestigious hunting weapon. Aqhat denies Anat's ability to hunt, but Anat 'teaches him a lesson' by hunting the hunter. In this reversal of Aqhat's normal role, we can appreciate that the characterisation of Anat here is more developed than that of the Baal Cycle. Anat not only reverses the hunter/prey role for Aqhat, she also reverses normal burial practice by dismembering his body so that the birds can eat him, rather than gathering him up for burial. Throughout this narrative, we witness the terrible vengeance that Anat is capable of, and which we have already witnessed in 1.6.ii.

In the chapter discussing other mythic texts we found that the picture of Anat as a formidable warrior is one that is used, for example, in 1.10.ii.24f. and 1.13.3f., whilst in 1.82 Anat and Baal are both called on to use their warrior (or perhaps hunting?) skills to combat the ghost of a woman. However, one of the most striking things we found came in texts 1.10-1.13 where Anat and Baal are seen engaged in sexual intercourse. This conclusion is not new, but is one that has been forcefully challenged by Walls (1992) and Day (1991 and 1992) who conclude that Anat is a virgin goddess in the true English sense of the word. Walls' assessment of the character of Anat is greatly influenced by this supposition, but if my conclusions are accepted then the line adopted by Walls and Day cannot be accepted.

In my final chapter we find that Anat plays a full part in the cultic life at Ugarit. She is part of the 'canonical' sequence of deities that we found are used to make up further lists. Furthermore, we found that she is often placed with a particular grouping of deities; Gatharu, Shapshu, Yarikh and the *gtrm* all of whom appear to have a connection with the underworld and, therefore, the cult of the dead. This would suit her predominant characterisation as a warrior goddess and huntress, one who weeps over Baal and buries his body, and weeps over Aqhat but then dismembers his body.

Of course there is much more in these texts than that which I have outlined above, but it would be impossible to repeat all of the previous study as part of the conclusions. In this dissertation I have attempted to lay the groundwork for further study into the characterisation of Anat by bringing together a manageable amount of data so that a reasonable level of discussion can be entered into. It has looked at each body of material on its own terms, including the distinction within the Ugaritic material between cult and myth. It is perhaps not surprising that a study of this nature raises more questions than it answers, and another study of at least the same length would be needed to even begin to address them. However, if this work has raised an interest in the fascinating character of the goddess Anat, then perhaps it has served its task.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abubakr, Abd el Monem Joussef
1937 *Untersuchungen über die ägyptischen Kronen*. J.J. Augustin: Glückstadt.
- Ackerman, Susan
1992 *Under Every Green Tree: Popular Religion in Sixth-Century Judah*. (Harvard Semitic Monographs 46) Scholars Press: Atlanta, Georgia.
- Ackroyd, Peter R.
1983 Goddesses, Women and Jezebel. In Cameron *et al.* (eds), *Images of Women in Antiquity*, 245-259.
- Albright, William Foxwell
1925 The Evolution of the West Semitic Divinity 'An-'Anat-'Atta. *AJSL* 41: 73-101.
1925a Further Observations on the Name 'Anat-'Attah. *AJSL* 41: 283-285.
1933 The North-Canaanite Epic of 'Al'êyân Ba'al and Mô't. *JPOS* 12: 185-208.
1935 The Names Shaddai and Abram. *JBL* 54: 173-204.
1938 Recent Progress in North-Canaanite Research. *BASOR* 70: 18-24.
1954 Northwest-Semitic Names in a List of Egyptian Slaves from the Eighteenth Century B.C. *JAOS* 74: 222-233.
1954a Some Observations on the New Material for the History of the Alphabet. *BASOR* 134: 26.
1968 *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*. (Jordan Lectures in Comparative Religion VII) The Athlone Press: London.
- Albright, William Foxwell and G.E. Mendenhall
1942 The Creation of the Composite Bow in Canaanite Mythology. *JNES* 1: 227-229.
- Aldred, Cyril
1978 *Jewels of the Pharaohs: Egyptian Jewelry of the Dynastic Period*. (2nd ed.) Thames and Hudson Ltd: London.
- Archi, Alfonso
1985 *Testi Amministrativi: Assegnazioni de Tessuti (Archivio L.2769)*. (Archivi Reali di Ebla 1) Missione Archeologica Italiana in Siria: Rome.
1988 *Testi Amministrativi: Registrazioni di Metalli e Tessuti (L.2769)*. (Archivi Reali di Ebla 7) Missione Archeologica Italiana in Siria: Rome.
- Archi, Alfonso, and Maria Giovanna Biga
1982 *Testi Amministrativi di Vario Contenuto (Archivio L.2769: TM.75.G.3000-4101)*. (Archivi Reali di Ebla 3) Missione Archeologica Italiana in Siria: Rome.
1988 *Testi Amministrativi: Registrazioni di Metalli e Tessuti (L.2769)*. (Archivi Reali di Ebla 7) Missione Archeologica Italiana in Siria: Rome.
- Astour, Michael C.
1963 Un Text d'Ugarit Récemment découvert et ses Rapports avec l'Origine des Cultes Bachiques Grecs. *RHR* 164: 1-15.
1966 Some New Divine Names From Ugarit. *JAOS* 86: 277-284.
1988 Remarks on KTU 1.96. *SEL* 5: 13-24.
- Bakry, Hassan S.K.
1973 The discovery of a Temple of Merenptah at On. *Aegyptus* 53: 3-21.
- Baldacci, M.
1978 A Lexical Question Concerning the Ugaritic Anath's Text. *UF* 10: 417-418.

- Bardet, Guillaume, Francis Joannès, Bertrand Lafont, Denis Soubeyran, and Pierre Villard
1984 *Archives Administratives de Mari I*. (Archives Royales de Mari 23) Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations: Paris.
- Barnett, R.D.
1969 Anath, Baal and Pasargadae. *MUSJ* 45: 405-422.
1978 The Earliest Representation of Anath. *EI* 14: 28-31.
- Barré, Michael L.
1983 *The God-List in the Treaty Between Hannibal and Philip V of Macedonia: A Study in Light of the Ancient Near Eastern Treaty Tradition*. The John Hopkins University Press: Baltimore.
- Barrelet, Marie-Thérèse
1955 Les Déesses Armées et Ailées. *Syria* 32: 222-260.
1958 Deux Déesses Syro-Phéniciennes sur un Bronze du Louvre. *Syria* 35: 27-44.
- Batto, Bernard Frank
1974 *Studies on Women at Mari*. The John Hopkins University Press: Baltimore.
- Bergman, C.A., and Edward McEwen
1988 Experimental Archery: Projectile Velocities and Comparison of Bow Performances. *Antiquity* 62: 658-670.
- Bérard, J.
1952 Les Hyksos et la Légende d'Io. *Syria* 29: 1-43.
- Berlin, A.
1983 Point of View in Biblical Narrative. In Geller (ed.), *A Sense of Text: The Art of Language in the Study of Biblical Literature: Papers from a Symposium at the Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, May 11, 1982*. (Jewish Quarterly Review 1982) Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, Indiana, 71-113.
- Bermant, Chaim, and Michael Weitzman
1979 *Ebla: An Archaeological Enigma*. Weidenfeld and Nicolson: London.
- Beyerlin, Walter (ed.)
1978 *Near Eastern Religious Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. SCM Press Ltd: London.
- Biga, Maria Giovanna, and Luci Milano
1984 *Testi Amministrativi: Assegnazioni di Tessuti (Archivo L.2769)*. (Archivi Reali di Ebla 4) Missione Archeologica Italiana in Siria: Rome.
- Binger, Tilde
1992 Fighting the Dragon: Another Look at the Theme in the Ugaritic Texts. *SJOT* 6: 139-149.
- Biot, Maurice
1974 *Lettres de Yaqqim-Addu Gouverneur de Sagarâtum*. (Archives Royales de Mari 14) Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner: Paris.
- Biot, Maurice, Jean-Robert Kupper and Olivier Rouault
1979 *Répertoire Analytique II: Tomes I-XIV, XVIII et Textes Divers Hors-Collection*. (Archives Royales de Mari 16/1) Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner: Paris.

- Bleeker, C.J.
1973 *Hathor and Thoth: Two Key Figures of the Ancient Egyptian Religion*. E.J. Brill: Leiden.
- Blok, H.P.
1930 *Drei Stelen aus der Spätzeit im Haagner Museum*. AO 8: 177-234.
- Bonhême, Marie-Ange, and Annie Forgeau
1988 *Pharaon: Les Secrets du Pouvoir*. Armond Colin: Paris.
- Bordreuil, Pierre, and André Caquot
1979 *Les Textes en Cunéiformes Alphabétiques Découverts en 1977 à Ibn Hani*. Syria 56: 295-315.
1980 *Les Textes en Cunéiformes Alphabétiques Découverts en 1978 à Ibn Hani*. Syria 57: 343-373.
- Bordreuil, Pierre, and Dennis Graham Pardee
1989 *La Trouvaille Epigraphique de L'Ougarit: 1. Concordance*. (Ras Shamra - Ougarit 5) Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations: Paris.
1993 *Le Combat de Ba'lu avec Yammu d'après les Textes Ougaritiques*. MARI 7: 63-70.
- Boreux, Charles
1926 *L'Art Egyptien*. Librairie Nationale d'Art et d'Histoire: Paris.
1939 *La Stèle C 86 du Musée du Louvre et les stèles similaires*. In Dussaud (ed.), *Mélanges Syriens Offerts à Monsieur René Dussaud*, 673-687.
- Borger, Rykle
1956 *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons Königs von Assyrien*. (Archiv für Orientforschung 9) Graz.
1957 *Anath-Bethel*. VT 7: 102-104.
1988 *Assyrisch-Babylonische Zeichenliste*. (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 33/33A, 4th ed.) Verlag Butzon & Bercker Kevelaer: Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- Bottéro, Jean
1957 *Textes Economiques et Administratifs*. (Archives Royales de Mari 7) Imprimerie Nationale: Paris.
- Boyer, Georges
1958 *Textes Juridiques*. (Archives Royales de Mari 8) Imprimerie Nationale: Paris.
- Bowman III, Charles Henry
1978 *The Goddess Anatu in the Ancient Near East*. (Unpublished PhD Dissertation) University of California: Berkeley.
- Bowman III, Charles Henry, and Robert B. Coote
1980 *A Narrative Incantation for Snakebite*. UF 12: 135-139.
- Breasted, James Henry
1906 *Ancient Records of Egypt: Historical Documents from the Earliest Times to the Persian Conquest*. (5 Vols) University of Chicago Press: Chicago, Illinois.
- British Museum
1930 *A General Introductory Guide to the Egyptian Collections*. British Museum: London.

- Brooklyn Museum
1957 *Five Years of Collecting Egyptian Art, 1951-1956: Catalogue of an exhibition held at the Brooklyn Museum 11 December, 1956 to 17 March, 1957.* Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences: Brooklyn.
- Brown, F., Driver, S.R., and C.A. Briggs (eds)
1979 *The New Brown-Driver-Briggs-Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon: With an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic.* Hendrickson: Peabody, Massachusetts.
- Brown, John Pairman
1993 Archery in the Ancient World: «Its Name is Life, its Work is Death». *BZ* 37: 26-42.
- Budge, E.A. Wallis
1904 *The Gods of the Egyptians: Studies in Egyptian Mythology.* Methuen and Co. Ltd: London.
1914 *Egyptian Sculptors in the British Museum.* British Museum Publications: London.
- Burke, Madeleine Lurton
1963 *Textes Administratifs de la Salle 111 du Palais.* (Archives Royales de Mari 11) Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner: Paris.
- Cameron, Averil, and Amélie Kuhrt (eds)
1983 *Images of Women in Antiquity.* Croom Helm: London.
- Caquot, André
1976 La Tablette RS 24. 252 et la Question des Rephaim Ougaritiques. *Syria* 53: 295-304.
1978 Remarques sur la Tablette Ougaritique RS 1929 no 6 (CTA 13). *Eretz-Israel* 14: 14*-18*.
1979 Une Episode Peu Connue du Mythe de Baal et de la Génisse (19.54=PRU V, 124=KTU 1.93). *UF* 11: 101-104.
1985 Une Nouvelle Interpretation de KTU 1.19 I 1-19. *SEL* 2: 93-114.
1988 Un Recueil Ougaritique de Formules Magiques: KTU 1.82. *SEL* 5: 31-43.
- Caquot, André, Jean-Michel De Tarragon, and J-L. Cunchillos
1989 *Textes Ougaritiques: Tome II. Textes Religieux et Rituels: Correspondance.* (Littératures Anciennes du Proche-Orient 14) Les Editions du Cerf: Paris.
- Caquot, André, and Maurice Sznycer
1980 *Ugaritic Religion.* (Iconography of Religions, Section XV: Mesopotamia and the Near East, Fascicle 8) E.J. Brill: Leiden.
- Caquot, André, Maurice Sznycer, and Andrée Herdner
1974 *Textes Ougaritiques: Tome I: Mythes et Légendes, Introduction, Traduction, Commentaire.* (Littératures Anciennes du Proche-Orient 7) Les Editions du Cerf: Paris.
- Cassuto, Umberto
1971 *The Goddess Anath: Canaanite Epics of the Patriarchal Age. Texts, Hebrew Translation, Commentary and Introduction.* Magnes Press: Jerusalem.
- Cathcart, Kevin, and Wilfred G.E. Watson
1980 Weathering a Wake: A Cure for a Carousal. *PIBI* 4: 35-58.

- Cazelles, Henri
1956 L'Hymne ugaritique à Anat. *Syria* 33: 49-57.
- Clamer, Christa
1980 A Gold Plaque from Tel Lachish. *Tell Aviv* 7: 152-162.
- Clédat, Jean
1918 Notes sur l'Isthme de Suez. *BIFAO* 15: 201-228.
- Clifford, Richard J.
1972 *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament*. (Harvard Semitic Monographs 4) Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts.
1990 Phoenician Religion. *BASOR* 279: 55-64.
- Clines, David J.A. (ed.)
1993 *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew: Volume 1*. Sheffield Academic Press: University of Sheffield.
- Cooper, Alan
1987 Mlk 'Im: 'Eternal King' or 'King of Eternity'? In Marks and Good (eds), 1987, *Love and Death in the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of Marvin H. Pope*, 1-7.
1988 Two Exegetical Notes on Aqht. *UF* 20: 19-26.
- Couroyer, B.
1964 Trois épithètes de Ramsès II. *Orientalia* 33: 443-460.
- Cowley, A.
1923 *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* Clarendon Press: Oxford.
- Craigie, Peter C.
1972 A Reconsideration of Shamgar ben Anath (Jud 3:31 and 5:6). *JBL* 91: 239-240.
1978 Deborah and Anat: A Study of Poetic Imagery. *ZAW* 90: 374-381.
1983 *Psalms 1-50*. (Word Biblical Commentary) Word Books Publisher: Waco, Texas.
- Crawford, Harriet
1991 *Sumer and the Sumerians*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Cross, Frank Moore Jr.
1973 *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Crowfoot, J.W.
1934 An Expedition to Balu'ah. *PEFQS* 1934: 76-84 + Pls.
- Cutler, B., and J. Macdonald
1973 An Akkadian Cognate to Ugaritic *BRLT*. *UF* 5: 67-70.
- Dahood, S.J. Mitchell
1958 Ancient Semitic Divinities in Syria and Palestine. In Moscati (ed.), 1958, *Le Antiche Divinità Semitiche*, 65-94.
1965 *Ugaritic - Hebrew Philology*. Pontifical Biblical Institute: Rome.
1966-70 *Psalms I-III*. (Anchor Bible) Doubleday & Company, Inc: Garden City, New York.
1978 Exodus 15,2 'anwēhû and Ugaritic šnwt. *Biblica* 59: 260-261.

- Dalglisch, Edward R.
1992 Bethel. In Freedman (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, I.706-710.
- Dalley, Stephanie
1984 *Mari and Karana: Two Old Babylonian Cities*. Longman: London.
1991 *Myths from Mesopotamia, Creation, the Flood, Gilgamesh and Others*. (World Classics) Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Daum, Werner (ed.)
1988 *Jemen*. Pinguin Verlag: Innsbruck.
- Dawson, W.R., and T.E. Peet
1933 The So Called Poem on the King's Chariot. *JEA* 19: 167-174.
- Day, John
1979 Echoes of Baal's Seven Thunders and Lightnings in Psalm XXIX and Habakkuk III 9 and the Identity of the Seraphim in Isaiah VI. *VT* 29: 143-151.
1985 *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Day, Peggy L.
1991 Why is Anat a Warrior and a Hunter? In Jobling *et al.* (eds), *The Bible and the Politics of Exegesis: Essays in Honor of Norman K. Gottwald on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. The Pilgrim Press: Cleveland, Ohio, 141-146.
1992 Anat: Ugarit's 'Mistress of Animals'. *JNES* 51: 181-190.
- De Boer, P.A.H.
1974 *Fatherhood and Motherhood in Israelite and Judean Piety*. E.J. Brill: Leiden.
- De Moor, Johannes C.
1966 Der *mdl* Baals im Ugaritischen. *ZAW* 78: 70.
1969 Studies in the New Alphabetic Texts from Ras Shamra I. *UF* 1: 167-188.
1970 Studies in the New Alphabetic Texts from Ras Shamra II. *UF* 2: 303-328.
1970a The Semitic Pantheon of Ugarit. *UF* 2: 187-228.
1971 *The Seasonal Pattern in the Ugaritic Myth of Balu: According to the Version of Ilmilku*. (AOAT 16) Verlag Butzon & Bercker Kevelaer: Neukirchen-Vluyn.
1971a The Ash in Ugarit. *UF* 3: 349-350.
1972 *New Year with Canaanites and Israelites*. J.H. Kok: Kampen.
1979 Contributions to the Ugaritic Lexicon. *UF* 11: 639-653.
1980 An Incantation against Infertility (KTU 1.13). *UF* 12: 305-310.
1986 Ugaritic Smalltalk. *UF* 17: 219-223.
1987 *An Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit*. E.J. Brill: Leiden.
1988 East of Eden. *ZAW* 100: 105-111.
1990 *The Rise of Yahwism: The Roots of Israelite Monotheism*. (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 91) Leuven University Press: Leuven.
- De Moor, Johannes C., and Klaas Spronk
1984 More on Demons from Ugarit (KTU 1.82). *UF* 16: 237-250.
1987 *A Cuneiform Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit*. E.J. Brill: Leiden.
- Dc Vogüé, Le Comte
1868 *Mélanges d'Archéologie Orientale*. Imprimerie Impériale: Paris.
- Deem, Ariella
1978 The Goddess Anath and some Biblical Hebrew Cruces. *JSS* 23: 25-30.

- Del Olmo Lete, Gregorio
- 1977 Notes on Ugaritic Semantics III. *UF* 9: 31-46.
- 1978 Notes on Ugaritic Semantics IV. *UF* 10: 37-46.
- 1981a Le Mythe de la Vierge-Mère Anatu. *UF* 13: 49-62.
- 1981b *Mitos y Leyendas de Canaan: Según la Tradición de Ugarit*. (Institucion San Jeronimo para la Investigacion Biblica, Fuentes de la Ciencia Biblica 1) Ediciones Cristiandad: Madrid.
- 1982 Notes on Ugaritic Semantics V. *UF* 14: 55-69.
- 1992 Un conjuro ugarítico contra el 'mal ojo'. *AF* 15: 7-16.
- 1992a *La Religión Cananea Según la Liturgia de Ugarit: Estudio Textual*. (Aula Orientalis - Supplementa 3) Editorial Ausa: Barcelona.
- Dever, William G.
- 1993 What Remains of the House that Albright Built? *BA* 56: 25-35.
- Dhorme, Edouard
- 1928 Les Amorrhéens. *RB* 37: 61-79, 161-180.
- Dietrich, M., and Oswald Loretz
- 1972 Zur Ugaritischen Lexikographie (V). *UF* 4: 27-35.
- 1977 *gṣr* 'abschneiden, abkneifen' im Ugar. und Hebr. *UF* 9: 51-56.
- 1977a *anš(t)* und *(m)inš(t)* im Ugaritischen. *UF* 9: 47-50.
- 1978 Bemerkungen zum Aqhat-Text: Zur Ugaritischen Lexikographie. *UF* 10: 65-71.
- 1979 Einzelfragen zu Wörtern aus den Ugaritischen Mythen und Wirtschaftstexten. *UF* 11: 189-198.
- 1980 Baal RPU in KTU 1.108; 1.113 und nach 1.17 vi 25-33. *UF* 12: 171-182.
- 1980a Die Bannung von Schlangengift (KTU 1.100 und KTU 1.107:7b-13a.19b-20). *UF* 12: 153-170.
- 1980b Ämter und Titel des Schreibers ILMLK von Ugarit. *UF* 12: 387-389.
- 1980c Anat's grosse Sprünge: Zu KTU 1.13 iv 31-40 et par. *UF* 12: 383-386.
- 1981 Neue Studien zu den Ritualtexten aus Ugarit (I). *UF* 13: 63-100.
- 1985 Sieges und Thronbesteigungslied Baals. *UF* 17: 129-146.
- 1986 Die Trauer Els und Anats (KTU 1.5 vi 11-22, 31-1:6 i 5). *UF* 18: 101-110.
- 1990 *Mantik in Ugarit. Keilalphabetische Texte der Opferschau - Omensammlungen Nekromantie*. (Abhandlungen zur Literatur Alt-Syrien-Palästinas 3) UGARIT-Verlag: Münster.
- 1992 *Jahwe und seine Aschera: Anthropomorphes Kultbild in Mesopotamien, Ugarit und Israel*. (Ugaritisch-Biblische Literatur 9) Ugarit-Forlag: Münster.
- Dietrich, M., Oswald Loretz, and J. Sanmartín
- 1973 Die Ugaritischen Verben *MRR* I, *MRR* II, und *MRR* III: Zur Ugaritischen Lexikographie X. *UF* 5: 119-122.
- 1973a PGR im Ugaritischen. *UF* 5: 289-291.
- 1974 Zur Ugaritischen Lexikographie (XI). *UF* 6: 19-38.
- 1975 Die Texteinheiten in RS 1.2 - CTA 32 und RS 17.100 - CTA Appendice I. *UF* 7: 141-146.
- 1975a Der Gott *TRMN* in den Ugarit-Texten. *UF* 7: 557-558.
- 1975b Das Ritual RS 1.5 = CTA 33. *UF* 7: 525-528.
- 1975c Die Götterliste RS 24.246 = Ug. 5, S. 594 Nr. 14. *UF* 7: 545-546.
- 1975d Stichometrische Probleme in RS 24.245. *UF* 7: 534-535.
- 1976 *Die Keilalphabetische Texte aus Ugarit: Teil I, Transkription*. Verlag Butzon & Bercker Kevclacr: Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- 1976a Die Ugaritischen Totengeister *RPU(M)* und die Biblischen Rephaim. *UF* 8: 45-52.

- Dijkstra, Meindert
 1970 A Note on CTA 3:D.45-46. *UF* 2: 333-334.
 1979 Some Reflections on the Legend of Aqhat. *UF* 11: 199-210.
 1983 Contributions to the Reconstruction of the Myth of Baal. *UF* 15: 25-31.
 1984 The Ritual KTU 1.46 (-RS 1.9) and its Duplicates. *UF* 16: 69-76.
 1986 An Ugaritic Fable (KTU 1.93). *UF* 18: 199-210.
 1988 The Legend of Danel and the Rephaim. *UF* 20: 35-51.
- Dijkstra, Meindert, and Johannes C. de Moor
 1975 Problematic Passages in the Legend of Aqhatu. *UF* 7: 171-215.
- Donner, H., and W. Röllig
 1971-76 *Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften*. (3 vols) Otto Harrassowitz: Wiesbaden.
- Dossin, Georges
 1938 Les Archives Epistolaires du Palais de Mari. *Syria* 19: 105-126.
 1950 Le Pantheon de Mari. In Parrot (ed.), *Studia Mariana*, 41-50.
 1950a *Correspondance de Šamši-Addu et ses fils*. (Archives Royales de Mari 1) Imprimerie Nationale: Paris.
 1951 *Correspondance de Šamši-Addu et de ses fils (Suite)*. (Archives Royales de Mari 4) Imprimerie Nationale: Paris.
 1971 Deux listes nominatives du règne de Sûmu Iaman. *RA* 65: 37-66.
- Dossin, Georges, J. Bottéro, M. Birot, M. Lurton Burke, J.-R. Kupper and A. Finet
 1964 *Textes Divers*. (Archives Royales de Mari 13) Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner: Paris.
- Dressler, Harold H.P.
 1975 Is the Bow of Aqhat a Symbol of Virility? *UF* 7: 217-220.
 1979 The Metamorphosis of a Lacuna: Is AT AHJ WAN a Proposal of Marriage? *UF* 11: 211-217.
- Drioton, E.
 1933 À propos de la stèle du Balou'a. *RB* 42: 353-365.
- Driver, G.R.
 1956 *Canaanite Myths and Legends*. T. & T. Clark Ltd.: Edinburgh.
- Du Mesnil du Buisson, Robert
 1973 *Nouvelles études sur les dieux et les mythes de Canaan*. E.J. Brill: Leiden.
- Dumézil, Georges
 1970 *The Destiny of the Warrior*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, Illinois.
- Dupont-Sommer, André
 1956 Une Stèle Araméenne d'un Prêtre de Ba'al Trouvée en Egypte. *Syria* 33: 79-87.
- Durand, Jean-Marie
 1983 *Textes Administratifs des Salles 134 et 160 du Palais de Mari*. (Archives Royales de Mari 21) Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner: Paris.
- Dussaud, René
 1931 La Mythologie Phénicienne d'après les Tablettes de Ras Shamra. *RHR* 104: 353-408.
 1934 Quelques précisions touchant les Hyksos. *RHR* 109: 113-128.

- 1938 Les combats sanglants de Anat et le pouvoir universel de El (V AB et VI AB). *RHR* 118: 133-169.
- Dussaud, René (ed.)
1939 *Mélanges Syriens Offerts à Monsieur René Dussaud*. (Haut-Commissariat de la République Française en Syrie et au Liban Service des Antiquités Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique 30, 2 vols) Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner: Paris.
- Eaton, Alfred Wade
1964 *The Goddess Anat: The History of her Cult, her Mythology and her Iconography*. (Unpublished PhD Dissertation) Yale University Press: New Haven.
- Edgerton, William F. and John A. Wilson
1936 *Historical Records of Ramses III: The Texts in Medinet Habu Volumes I and II Translated with Explanatory Notes*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, Illinois.
- Edwards, I.E.S.
1955 A Relief of Qudshu-Astarte-Anath in the Winchester College Collection. *JNES* 14: 49-51.
- Edzard, Dietz Otto
1981 *Verwaltungstexte Verschiedenen Inhalts aus dem Archiv L.2769*. (Archivi Reali di Ebla 2) Missione Archeologica Italiana in Siria: Rome.
1984 *Hymnen, Beschwörungen und Verwandtes aus dem Archiv L.2769*. (Archivi Reali di Ebla 5) Missione Archeologica Italiana in Siria: Rome.
- Emerton, J.A.
1972 A Difficult Part of Mot's Message to Baal in the Ugaritic Texts. *AJBA* 2: 50-71.
- Ermann, Adolf and Hermann Grapow
1926-63 *Wörterbuch der Aegyptischen Sprache*. J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung: Leipzig.
- Faulkner, Raymond O.
1972 *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian*. (2nd. ed.) Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Fensham, F.C.
1971 Some Remarks on the First Three Mythological Texts of Ugaritica V. *UF* 3: 21-24. (24)
- Fenton T.L.
1969 Ugaritica - Biblica. *UF* 1: 65-70.
1969a Passages in Ugaritic Discourse - Restorations and Observations. *UF* 1: 199-200.
- Ferrara, A.J., and Simon B. Parker
1972 Seating Arrangements at Divine Banquets. *UF* 4: 37-40.
- Finkelstein, J.J.
1966 Sex Offenses in Sumerian Laws. *JAOS* 86: 355-372.
- Fisher, Loren R.
1970 A New Ritual Calendar From Ugarit. *HTR* 63: 485-501.

- Fisher, Loren R. and F.B. Knutson
1969 An Enthronement Ritual at Ugarit. *JNES* 28: 157-167.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A., S.J., and Stephen A. Kaufman (With the collaboration of Stephan F. Bennett and Edward M. Cook)
1992 *An Aramaic Bibliography. Part I: Old, Official, and Biblical Aramaic.* (Publications of The Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project) The John Hopkins University Press: Baltimore.
- Fleming, Daniel E.
1992 *The Installation of Baal's High Priestess at Emar: A Window on Ancient Syrian Religion.* (Harvard Semitic Studies) Scholars Press: Atlanta, Georgia.
- Fontenrose, Joseph
1966 *The Ritual Theory of Myth.* (Folklore Studies 18) University of California: Berkeley.
- Foster, Benjamin R.
1993 *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature.* (2 vols) CDL Press: Bethesda, Maryland.
- Frankfort, Henri
1939 *Cylinder Seals: A Documentary Essay on the Art and Religion of the Ancient Near East.* Macmillan and Company Ltd.: London.
1954 *The Art and Architecture of the Ancient Orient.* (Pelican History of Art) Penguin Books: Harmondsworth.
- Freedman, David Noel (ed.)
1992 *The Anchor Bible Dictionary.* Doubleday & Company, Inc: Garden City, New York.
- Fronzaroli, Pelio
1977 West Semitic Toponymy in Northern Syria in the Third Millennium BC. *JSS* 22: 141-166.
- Fulco, William J.
1976 *The Canaanite God Rešep.* American Oriental Society: New Haven, CT.
1992 Ashimah. In Freedman (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, I.487.
- Gardiner, Alan
1931 *The Library of A. Chester Beatty.* Oxford University Press: Oxford.
1932 The Astarte Papyrus. In Glanville (ed.), *Studies Presented to F.L. Griffith*, 74-85.
1957 *Egyptian Grammar: Being an Introduction to the Study of Hieroglyphs.* (3rd ed.) Griffith Institute: Oxford.
1961 *Egypt of the Pharaohs.* Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Gardiner, Alan H. (ed.)
1935 *Hieratic Papyrus in the British Museum: Third Series, Chester Beatty Gift.* (2 Vols) British Museum Publications: London.
1941-52 *The Wilbour Papyrus.* (4 Vols, Published for The Brooklyn Museum) Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Gaster, Theodore H.
1946-47 The Canaanite Epic of Keret. *JQR* 37: 285-293.

- 1975 *Thespis: Ritual, Myth, and Drama in the Ancient Near East*. Gordian Press: New York.
- Gaunt, G.D.
1983 Notes on the Recognition of Early Composite Bows in the Archaeological Period. *JSAA* 26: 42-44.
- Gauthier, Henri
1908-14 *Livre des Rois d'Égypte*. (Mémoires publiés par les Membres de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire 17-19, 5 Vols) Le Caire, Imprimerie de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale: Paris.
- Gelb, Ignace J.
1954 Review of *Studia Mariana*. *JNES* 13: 269-271.
- Gelb, Ignace J., Benno Landsberger, A. Leo Oppenheim, and Erica Reiner (Editorial Board)
1956- *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. The Oriental Institute: Chicago.
- Geller, S.A. (ed.)
1983 *A Sense of Text: The Art of Language in the Study of Biblical Literature: Papers from a Symposium at the Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, May 11, 1982*. (Jewish Quarterly Review 1982) Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, Indiana.
- Gibson, John C.L.
1974 Myth, Legend and Folklore in the Ugaritic Keret and Aqhat Texts. *VTSup* 28: 60-68. (Congress Volume Edinburgh, 1974, E.J. Brill: Leiden).
1978 *Canaanite Myths and Legends*. (2nd ed.) T. and T. Clark Ltd: Edinburgh.
1984 The Theology of the Ugaritic Baal Cycle. *Orientalia* 53: 202-219.
- Goetze, Albrecht
1944 Peace on Earth. *BASOR* 93: 17-20.
- Good, Robert M.
1987 Exodus 32:18. In Marks *et al.* (eds), *Love and Death in the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of Marvin H. Pope*, 137-142.
1991 On RS 24.252. *UF* 23: 155-160.
- Gordon, Cyrus H.
1965 *Ugaritic Textbook*. (Analecta Orientalia 38) Pontifical Biblical Institute: Rome.
1977 Poetic Legends and Myths from Ugarit. *Berytus* 25: 5-133.
1985 The Ugaritic Texts: Half a Century of Research. In Biran *et al.* (eds), *Biblical Archaeology Today: Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, Jerusalem, April 1984*, 492-501.
- Goyon, Georges
1938 Deux Stèles de Ramses II au Gebel Chalouf. *Kêmi* 7: 115-122.
- Grabbe, L.L.
1976 The Seasonal Pattern and the Baal Cycle. *UF* 8: 57-64.
- Gray, John
1965 *The Legacy of Canaan*. (2nd ed.) E.J. Brill: Leiden.
1978 Canaanite Religion and Old Testament Study in the Light of New Alphabetic Texts from Ras Shamra. *Ugaritica* 7: 79-108.

- 1979 The Blood Bath of the Goddess Anat in the Ras Shamra Texts. *UF* 11: 315-324.
- Grdseloff, Bernhard
1942 *Les Débuts du Culte de Réchef en Egypte*. Le Caire, Imprimerie de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale: Paris.
- Greenstein, Edward L.
1982 'To Grasp the Hem' in Ugaritic Literature. *VT* 32: 217-218.
- Grelot, Pierre
1972 *Documents Araméens d'Egypte*. (Littératures Anciennes du Proche-Orient) Les Editions du Cerf: Paris.
- Gressmann, Hugo (ed.)
1926-1927 *Altorientalische Texte und Bilder zum Alten Testament*. Walter de Gruyter: Berlin.
- Gröndahl, Frauke
1967 *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit*. (Studia Pohl 1) Pontifical Biblical Institute: Rome.
- Haldar, Alfred
1971 *Who were the Amorites?* (Monographs on the Ancient Near East 1) E.J. Brill: Leiden.
- Hallo, William W., and Hayim Tadmor
1977 A Lawsuit from Hazor. *IEJ* 27: 1-11.
- Healey, John F.
1980 Ugaritic *hṭk*: A Note. *UF* 12: 408-409.
1983 Burning the Corn: new light on the killing of Motu. *Orientalia* 52: 248-251.
1985 The Akkadian 'Pantheon' List from Ugarit. *SEL* 2: 115-125.
1988 The 'Pantheon' of Ugarit: Further Notes. *SEL* 5: 103-111.
- Helck, Wolfgang
1971 *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 5, 2 vols) Otto Harrassowitz: Wiesbaden.
- Helck, Wolfgang, and Eberhard Otto (eds)
1975-92 *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*. (7 Vols) Otto Harrassowitz: Wiesbaden.
- Herdner, Andrée
1963 *Corpus des Tablettes en Cunéiformes Alphabétiques: Découvertes à Ras Shamra-Ugarit de 1929 à 1939*. (Mission de Ras Shamra 10, 2 Vols) Imprimerie Nationale: Paris.
1978 Nouveaux Textes Alphabétiques de Ras Shamra -XXIVe Campagne, 1961. *Ugaritica* 7: 1-74.
- Hestrin, Ruth
1987 The Lachish Ewer and the 'Asherah. *IEJ* 37: 212-223.
- Hillers, Delbert R.
1965 A Convention in Hebrew Literature: the Reaction to Bad News. *ZAW* 77: 86-90.
1973 The Bow of Aqhat: The Meaning of a Mythological Theme. In Hoffner (ed.), 1973, *Orient and Occident: Essays Presented to Cyrus H. Gordon on the Occasion of his Sixty-fifth Birthday*, 71-80.

- Hoffner, Harry A., Jr. (ed.)
1973 *Orient and Occident: Essays Presented to Cyrus H. Gordon on the Occasion of his Sixty-fifth Birthday.* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 22) Verlag Butzon & Bercker Kevelaer: Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- Hoftijzer, J.A.
1971 A Note on G 1083³: *išt'ir* and Related Matters. *UF* 3: 361-364.
- Horsfield, G., and L.H. Vincent
1932 Une stèle égypto-moabite au Balou'a. *RB* 41: 417-444.
- Huffman, Herbert Bardwell
1965 *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts: A Structural and Lexical Study.* The John Hopkins University Press: Baltimore.
- Irwin, W.H.
1983 The Extended Simile in RS 24.245 Obv. *UF* 15: 53-58.
- Israelit-Grol, Sarah (ed.)
1985 *Pharaonic Egypt: The Bible and Christianity.* Magnes Press: Jerusalem.
- Jamme, A.
1947 Le Panthéon Sud-Arabe Préislamique d'après les Sources Epigraphiques. *Le Muséon* 60: 57-147.
- Janowski, Bernd
1980 Erwägungen zur Vorgeschichte des Israelitischen *šalamîm*-Opfers. *UF* 12: 231-259.
- Jean, Charles F.
1950 Les Noms Propres de Personnes dans les Lettres de Mari. In Parrot (ed.), *Studia Mariana*, 63-98.
- Jobling, David, Peggy L. Day, and Gerald T. Sheppard (eds)
1991 *The Bible and the Politics of Exegesis: Essays in Honor of Norman K. Gottwald on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday.* The Pilgrim Press: Cleveland, Ohio.
- Kapelrud, Arvid S.
1952 *Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts.* G.E.C. Gad: Copenhagen.
1969 *The Violent Goddess: Anat in the Ras Shamra Texts.* Universitetsforlaget: Oslo.
- Kempinski, Aaron
1985 Some Observations on the Hyksos (XVth) Dynasty and its Canaanite Origins. In Israelit-Grol (ed.), *Pharaonic Egypt: The Bible and Christianity*, 129-137.
- Kenyon, Kathleen M.
1966 *Amorites and Canaanites.* (Schweich Lectures 1963) Oxford University Press for the British Academy: London.
- Kilmer, Anne Draffkorn
1974 The Cult Song with Music from Ancient Ugarit: Another Interpretation. *RA* 68: 69-82.
- Kirk, G.S.
1973 *Myth: Its Meaning and Functions in Ancient and Other Cultures.* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

- Kitchen, Kenneth A.
 1977 *The King List of Ugarit. UF 9: 131-142.*
 1982 *Pharaoh Triumphant: The Life and Times of Ramesses II, King of Egypt.* Aris & Phillips Ltd.: Warminster.
 1993 *Ramesside Inscriptions Translated and Annotated: Translations I. Ramesses I, Sethos I and Contemporaries.* Basil Blackwell: Oxford.
- Kloos, Carola
 1986 *YHWH's Combat with the Sea: A Canaanite Tradition in the Religion of Ancient Israel.* G.A. van Oorschot: Amsterdam.
- Klopsteg, Paul E.
 1987 *Turkish Archery and the Composite Bow.* Simon Archery Foundation: Manchester.
- Knudtzon, J.A.
 1915 *Die El-Amarna Tafeln: Mit Einleitung und Erläuterungen.* (Reihenfolge des Erscheinens der Vorderasiatischen Bibliothek 2) J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung: Leipzig.
- Koehler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner
 1983 *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexicon zum Alten Testament.* (3rd. ed.) E.J. Brill: Leiden.
- Korpel, Marjo Christina Annette
 1990 *A Rift in the Cloud: Ugaritic and Hebrew Descriptions of the Divine.* (Ugaritisch-Biblische Literatur 8) Ugarit-Forlag: Münster.
- Kottsieper, I.
 1984 KTU 1.100 - Versuch einer Deutung. *UF 16: 97-110.*
- Kraeling, E.G.
 1953 *The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri: New Documents of the Fifth Century B.C. from the Jewish Colony at Elephantine.* Yale University Press: New Haven.
- Kraus, Hans-Joachim
 1988 *Psalms 1-59: A Commentary.* (Translated from the 5th German ed. by Hilton C. Oswald) Augsburg Publishing House: Minneapolis.
- Krebern timer, Manfred
 1988 *Die Personennamen der Ebla-Texte: Eine Zwischenbilanz.* (Berliner Beiträge zum Vorderen Orient 7) Dietrich Reimer Verlag: Berlin.
- Kuentz, Charles
 1925 La "Stèle du Mariage" de Ramsès II. *ASAE 25: 181-238.*
- Kupper, Jean-Robert
 1954 *Correspondance de Bahdi-Lim Préfet du Palais de Mari.* (Archives Royales de Mari 6) Imprimerie Nationale: Paris.
 1983 *Documents administratifs de la salle 135 du Palais de Mari.* (Archives Royales de Mari 22) Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations: Paris.
- Kupper, Jean-Robert (ed.)
 1967 *XVe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale: La Civilisation de Mari.* (Les Congrès et Colloques de l'université de Liège 42) University of Liège.

- L'Heureux, Conrad E.
1979 *Rank Among the Canaanite Gods, El, Baal, and the Rephaim*. (Harvard Semitic Monographs 21) Scholars Press: Missoula, MT.
- Lackenbacher, Sylvie
1984 Nouveaux Documents d'Ugarit - II - Une Lettre de Mari? *MARI* 3: 185-189.
- Lalouette, Claire
1985 *L'empire des Ramsès*. Fayard: Paris.
- Lambert, Wilfred George
1985 The Pantheon of Mari. *MARI* 4: 525-539.
- Lane, Edward William
1863-1869 *An Arabic-English Lexicon*. (2 vols) Williams and Norgate: London.
- Laroche, Emmanuel
1968 Documents en Langue Hourrite Provenant de Ras Shamra. *Ugaritica* 5: 447-544.
- Layton, Scott C.
1990 *Archaic Features of Canaanite Personal names in the Hebrew Bible*. (Harvard Semitic Monographs 47) Scholars Press: Atlanta, Georgia.
- Le Lasseur, D.G.
1919 *Les Déesse Armées: dans l'Art Classique Grec et leurs Origines Orientales*. Librairie Hachette: Paris.
- Leclant, Jean
1951 Le rôle du lait et de l'allaitement d'après les Textes des Pyramides. *JNES* 10: 123-127.
1960 Astarté à cheval d'après les représentations égyptiennes. *Syria* 37: 1-67.
1975 Anat. In Wolfgang Helck and Eberhard Otto (eds), *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*, Vol. 1, 253-258.
1975a Astarte. In Helck and Otto (eds), *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*, Vol. 1, 499-509.
- Lefebvre, Gustave
1925 Une Version Abrégée de la "Stèle du Mariage". *ASAE* 25: 34-45.
- Leibovitch, J.
1961 Kent et Qadech. *Syria* 38: 23-34.
- Lesko, Barbara S.
1991 Women's Monumental Mark on Ancient Egypt. *BA* 54: 4-15.
- Levine, Baruch A., and Jean-Michel De Tarragon
1993 The King Proclaims the Day: Ugaritic Rites for the Vintage (KTU 1.41//1.87) *RB* 100: 76-115.
- Lewis, Theodore Joseph
1989 *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit*. (Harvard Semitic Monographs 39) Scholars Press: Atlanta, Georgia.
- Lewy, Julius
1934 Les Textes Paléo-Assyriens et l'Ancien Testament. *RHR* 110: 29-65.

- Lichtheim, Miriam
1976 Ancient Egyptian Literature: A Book of Readings. Vol. II The New Kingdom. University of California: Berkeley.
- Limet, Henri
1986 *Textes Administratifs relatifs aux Métaux*. (Archives Royales de Mari 25) Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations: Paris.
- Lipinski, Edouard
1965 Les Conceptions et Couches Merveilleuses de Anath. *Syria* 42: 45-73.
1967 Le dieu Lim. In Kupper (ed.), 1967, *XVe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale: La Civilisation de Mari*, 151-160.
1970 Banquet en L'Honneur de Baal CTA 3 (V AB) 1, 4-22. *UF* 2: 75-88.
1971 Epiphanie de Baal-Haddu RS 24.245. *UF* 3: 80-92.
1986 The Syro-Phoenician Iconography of Woman and Goddess (Review Article). *IEJ* 36: 87-96.
- Liverani, M.
1973 The Amorites. In Wiseman (ed.), *Peoples of Old Testament Times*.
1979 Histoire. In Pirot et al. (eds), *Dictionnaire de la Bible: Supplément*, 1295-1348.
- Lloyd, Jeffery B.
1990 The Banquet Theme in Ugaritic Narrative. *UF* 22: 169-193.
- Locher, Clemens
1986 *Die Ehre einer Frau in Israel*. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Freiburg: Universitätsverlag und Göttingen.
- Loewenstamm, Samuel E.
1959 The Muzzling of the Tannin in Ugaritic Myth. *IEJ* 9: 260-261.
1963 The Ugaritic Fertility Myth - a Reply. *IEJ* 13: 130-132.
1969 Eine Lehrhafte Ugaritische Trinkburleske. *UF* 1: 71-78.
1972 The Killing of Mot in Ugaritic Myth. *Orientalia* 41: 378-382.
1982 Did the Goddess Anat Wear Side-Whiskers and a Beard? A Reconsideration. *UF* 14: 119-123.
- Løkkegaard, Frede
1956 The Canaanite Divine Wetnurses. *ST* 10: 53-64.
1982 Some Reflexions on Reading F.O. Hvidberg-Hansen's *La déesse Tnt, une étude sur la religion cananéenne-punique* (review article). *UF* 14: 129-140.
- Loretz, Oswald
1987 KTU 1.101:1-3a und 1.2 iv 10 als Parallelen zu Ps 29.10. *ZAW* 99: 415-421.
- Maier, Walter Arthur, III
1986 *Ašerah: Extrabiblical Evidence*. (Harvard Semitic Monographs 37) Scholars Press: Atlanta, Georgia.
- Malamat, Abraham
1989 *Mari and the Early Israelite Experience*. (Schweich Lectures 1984) Oxford University Press for the British Academy: London.
- Marcus, David
1977 The Term 'Chin' in the Semitic Languages. *BASOR* 226: 53-60.

- Margulis, B.
 1970 A Ugaritic Psalm (RS 24. 252). *JBL* 89: 292-304.
 1970a A new Ugaritic farce (RS 24.258). *UF* 2: 131-138.
 1974 Weltbaum and Weltberg in Ugaritic Literature: Notes and Observations on RS 24.245. *ZAW* 86: 1-22.
- Margalit, Baruch
 1976 *Studia Ugaritica* II: 'Studies in Krt and Aqht'. *UF* 8: 137-192.
 1979-1980 The Ugaritic Feast of the Drunken Gods: Another Look at RS 24.258 (KTU 1.114). *Maarav* 2/1: 65-120.
 1980 *A Matter of >Life< and >Death<: A Study of the Baal-Mot Epic* (CTA 4-5-6). (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 206) Verlag Butzon & Bercker Kevelaer: Neukirchen-Vluyn.
 1981 Restorations and Reconstructions in the Epic of Aqht. *JNSL* 9: 75-117.
 1983 Lexicographical Notes on the Aqht Epic (Part I: KTU 1.17-18). *UF* 15: 65-103.
 1984 KTU 1.93 (= PRU 5: 124): The Prayer of a Sick Cow. *SEL* 1: 89-101.
 1984a Lexicographical Notes on the Aqht Epic (Part II: KTU 1.19). *UF* 16: 119-179.
 1989 *The Ugaritic Poem of AQHT*. Walter de Gruyter: Berlin.
 1990 The Meaning and Significance of Asherah. *VT* 40: 264-297.
- Marks, John H., and Robert M. Good (eds)
 1987 *Love and Death in the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of Marvin H. Pope*. Four Quarters: Guilford, CT.
- Martin, Geoffrey Thorndike
 1971 *Egyptian Administrative and Private-Name Seals: Principally of the Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period*. Griffith Institute: Oxford.
- Massart, A.
 1954 *The Leiden Magical Papyrus I 343 + I 345*. E.J. Brill: Leiden.
- Matthiae, Paolo
 1980 *Ebla: an Empire Rediscovered*. (Transl. Christopher Holme) Hodder and Stoughton: London.
 1984 New Discoveries at Ebla: The Excavation of the Western Palace and the Royal Necropolis of the Amorite Period. *BA* 47: 18-32.
- May, Herbert G.
 1984 *Oxford Bible Atlas*. (3rd ed., revised by John Day) Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- McEwen, Edward, and R. Miller
 1991 Early Bow Design and Construction. *Scientific American* 264/6: 50-56.
- McLeod, W.
 1970 *Composite Bows from the Tomb of Tut'ankhamūn*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Mendenhall, George E.
 1992 Amorites. In Freedman (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*.
- Meyer, Eduard
 1877 Ueber einige Semitische Götter. *ZDMG* 31: 716-741.

- Milik, J.T.
 1956 An Unpublished Arrow-Head with Phoenician Inscription of the 11th-10th Century B.C. *BASOR* 143: 3-6.
 1967 Les papyrus araméens d'Hermoupolis et les cultes syro-phéniciens en Egypte perse. *Biblica* 48: 546-622.
 1978 Quelques Tablettes Cunéiformes Alphabétiques d'Ugarit. *Ugaritica* 7: 135-146.
- Miller, Patrick D., Jr.
 1973 *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Montet, Pierre
 1933 *Les Nouvelles Fouilles de Tanis 1929-1932*. (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de Strasbourg - Deuxième Série 10) Les Belles Lettres: Paris.
 1937 *Les Reliques de l'Art Syrien dans l'Egypte du Nouvelle Empire*. Les Belles Lettres: Paris.
 1941 *Le Drame d'Avaris: Essai sur la Pénétration des Sémites en Egypte*. Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner: Paris.
 1958 *Everyday Life in Egypt in the Days of Ramesses the Great*. (Trans. by A.R. Maxwell-Hyslop and Margaret S. Drower) Edward Arnold (Publishers) Ltd.: London.
 1966 *Le Lac Sacré de Tanis*. (Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres 'Extrait des Mémoires de l'Académie' 44) C. Klincksieck: Paris.
- Moscatti, Sabatino (ed.)
 1958 *Le Antiche Divinità Semitici*. (Studi Semitici 1) Centro di Studi Semitici: Roma.
 1964 *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages*. Otto Harrassowitz: Wiesbaden.
- Naveh, Joseph, and Shaul Shaked
 1985 *Amulets and Magic Bowls: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity*. Magnes Press: Jerusalem.
- Negbi, Ora
 1964 A Canaanite Bronze Figure from Tel Dan. *IEJ* 14: 270-271.
 1976 *Canaanite Gods in Metal: An Archaeological Study of Ancient Syro-Palestinian Figurines*. (Publications of the Institute of Archaeology 5) Tel Aviv University: Tel Aviv.
- Newberry, Percy E.
 1906 *Egyptian Antiquities: Scarabs. An Introduction to the Study of Egyptian Seals and Signet Rings*. Archibald Constable and Co. Ltd.: London.
- Newby, P.H.
 1980 *Warrior Pharaohs: The Rise and Fall of the Egyptian Empire*. Faber and Faber: London.
- Nielsen, Ditlef
 1927 Zur Altarabischen Religion. In Nielsen (ed.), *Handbuch der Altarabischen Altertumskunde: Volume 1, Die Altarabische Kultur*, 177-250.
- Nielsen, Ditlef (ed.)
 1927 *Handbuch der Altarabischen Altertumskunde: Volume 1, Die Altarabische Kultur*. (In verbindung mit Geheimrat Fr. Hommel und Prof. Nik. Rhodokanakis) Nyt Nordisk Forlag: Kopenhagen.

- Nougayrol, Jean
1955 *Textes Accadiens et Hourrites des Archives Est, Ouest et Centrales.* (Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit 3) Imprimerie Nationale: Paris.
- 1956 *Textes Accadiens des Archives Sud.* (Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit 4) Imprimerie Nationale: Paris.
- 1968 *Textes Suméro-Accadiens des Archives et Bibliothèques Privées d'Ugarit. Ugaritica 5: 1-446.*
- Obermann, Julian
1948 *Ugaritic Mythology: A Study of Its Leading Motifs.* Yale University Press: New Haven.
- Oldenburg, Ulf
1969 *The Conflict Between El and Baal in Canaanite Religion.* (Supplements to Numen 3) E.J. Brill: Leiden.
- Pardee, Dennis Graham
1976 The Preposition in Ugaritic. *UF* 8: 213-322.
- 1977 Attestations of Ugaritic Verb/Preposition Combinations in Later Dialects. *UF* 9: 205-231.
- 1978 The Semitic Root *mrr* and the Etymology of Ugaritic *mr(r) brk*. *UF* 10: 249-288.
- 1980 The New Canaanite Myths and Legends. *BiOr* 37: 269-91.
- 1984 Will the Dragon Never be Muzzled? *UF* 16: 251-255.
- 1988 *Ras Shamra - Ougarit IV, Les Textes Para-Mythologiques de la 24e campagne (1961).* (Mémoire 77) Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations: Paris.
- Parker, Barbara
1949 Cylinder Seals from Palestine. *Iraq* 11: 1-43.
- Parker, Simon B.
1970 The Feast of Rāpi'u. *UF* 2: 243-249.
- 1989 *The Pre-Biblical Narrative Tradition: Essays on the Ugaritic Poems Keret and Aqhat.* Scholars Press: Atlanta, Georgia.
- 1992 Review of The Ugaritic Poem of AQHT - Margalit, B. *BASOR* 288: 90-92.
- Parrot, André (ed.)
1950 *Studia Mariana.* (Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui 4) E.J. Brill: Leiden.
- Paul, Shalom
1982 Two Cognate Semitic Terms for Mating and Copulation. *VT* 32: 492-494.
- Petrie, William Matthew Flinders
1906 *Hyksos and Israelite Cities.* British School of Archaeology in Egypt: London.
- 1917 *Scarabs and Cylinders with Names.* London School of Archaeology in Egypt: University College London.
- Pettinato, Giovanni
1978 L'Atlante Geografico del Vicino Oriente Antico attestato ad Ebla e ad Abū Ṣalabīkh. *Or* 47: 50-73.
- 1981 *The Archives of Ebla: An Empire Inscribed in Clay.* (With an afterword by Mitchell Dahood, S.J.) Doubleday & Company, Inc: Garden City, New York.
- Pirot, L., A. Robert, Henri Cazelles, and André Feuillet (eds)
1979 *Dictionnaire de la Bible: Supplément.* (Vol. 9) Letouzey & Ané: Paris.

- Pitard, Wayne T.
1992 A New Edition of the Rapi'uma Texts: KTU 1.20-22. *BASOR* 285: 33-77.
- Pomponio, F.
1983 I Nomi Divini Nei Testi di Ebla. *UF* 15: 141-156.
- Pope, Marvin H.
1955 *El in the Ugaritic Texts*. (Vetus Testamentum Supplements 2) E.J. Brill: Leiden.
1977 *Song of Songs*. (Anchor Bible) Doubleday & Company, Inc: Garden City, New York.
1987 The status of El at Ugarit. *UF* 19: 219-230.
- Pope, Marvin H. and Jeffrey H. Tigay
1971 A Description of Baal. *UF* 3: 117-130.
- Porten, Bezalel
1968 *Archives from Elephantine: The Life of an Ancient Jewish Military Colony*. University of California: Berkeley.
1992 Elephantine Papyri. In Freedman (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, II.445-455.
- Porten, Bezalel, and Ada Yardeni
1986 *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Egypt: I. Letters*. (The Hebrew University Department of the History of the Jewish People Texts and Studies for Students) Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, Indiana.
- Pritchard, James B. (ed.)
1954 *The Ancient Near East in Pictures Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton University Press: Princeton.
1969 *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. (3rd ed. with Supplement) Princeton University Press: Princeton.
- Rainey, A.F.
1971 Observations on Ugaritic Grammar. *UF* 3: 151-172.
1974 The Ugaritic Texts in Ugaritica 5. *JAOS* 94: 184-194.
1975 Reflections on the Suffix Conjugation in West Semitized Amarna Tablets. *UF* 5: 235-262.
- Ranke, Hermann
1935-52 *Die Ägyptischen Personennamen*. (2 vols) J.J. Augustin: Glückstadt.
- Rausing, Gad
1967 *The Bow: Some Notes on its Origin and Development*. C.W.K. Gleerup: Lund.
- Redford, Donald B.
1973 New Light on the Asiatic Campaigning of Horemheb. *BASOR* 211: 36-49.
- Redford, Donald B. and James M. Weinstein
1992 Hyksos. In Freedman (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, III.341-348.
- Reiter, Karin
1990 Falknerei in Ugarit. *UF* 22: 271-278.

- Renfro, Fred
1992 *Arabic-Ugaritic Lexical Studies*. (Abhandlungen zur Literatur Alt-Syrien-Palästinas 5) UGARIT-Verlag: Münster.
- Roccati, Alessandro
1972 Une Légende Egyptienne d'Anat. *RE* 24: 154-159.
- Rouault, Olivier
1978 *MUKANNIŠUM: L'administration et l'économie palatiales à Mari*. (Archives Royales de Mari 18) Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner: Paris.
- Rowe, Alan
1930 *The Topography and History of Beth-Shan*. University of Pennsylvania Press: Philadelphia.
1936 *Catalogue of Scarabs in the Palestine Museum*. Institut français: Cairo.
1940 *The Four Canaanite Temples of Beth-Shan: Part 1, The Temples and Cult Objects*. (Publications of the Palestine Section of the University Museum, University of Pennsylvania 2) University of Pennsylvania Press: Philadelphia.
- Rudolph, W., and H.P. Rüger (eds)
1977 *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. (2nd ed.) Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft: Stuttgart.
- Ryckmans, Jacques
1988 Die Altsüdarabische Religion. In Daum (ed.), *Jemen*, 111-115.
1989 Le Panthéon de l'Arabie du Sud Préislamique. *RHR* 206: 151-169.
- Sanmartín, J.
1978 Glossen zum Ugaritischen Lexikon (II). *UF* 10: 349-356.
1978a Die Ug. Basis *nšš* und das Nest des B'L (KTU 1.3 iv 1f). *UF* 10: 449-450.
1980 Die Haartracht der 'nt. *UF* 12: 341-344.
- Sarna, Nahum M.
1957 Epic Substratum in the Prose of Job. *JBL* 76: 13-25.
- Sauren, H. and G. Kestemont
1971 Keret Roi de Ḫubur. *UF* 3: 181-221.
- Schaeffer, Claude F.A.
1931 Les Fouilles de Minet-el-Beida et de Ras Shamra: Deuxième Campagne (Printemps 1930). *Syria* 12: 1-14.
1939 *Ugaritica: Etudes Relatives aux Découvertes de Ras Shamra*. (Mission de Ras Shamra 3) Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner: Paris.
1939a *The Cuneiform Texts of Ras Shamra-Ugarit*. (Schweich Lectures 1936) Oxford University Press for the British Academy: London.
1949 *Ugaritica II: Nouvelles études relatives aux découvertes de Ras Shamra*. (Mission de Ras Shamra 5) Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner: Paris.
1954 Les Fouilles de Ras Shamra-Ugarit: Quinzième, Seizième et Dix-Septième Campagnes (1951, 1952 et 1953), Rapport Sommaire. *Syria* 31: 14-67.
- Schaeffer-Forrer, Claude F.-A., contributions from P. Amiet, G. Chenet, M. Mallowan, K. Bittel, and E. Porada.
1983 *Corpus des Cylindres-Sceaux de Ras Shamra-Ugarit et d'Enkomi-Alasia*. (Mission Archéologique de Ras Shamra-Ugarit et d'Enkomi-Alasia 13) Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations: Paris.

- Seeden, Helga
1980 *The Standing Armed Figurines in the Levant.* (Prähistorische Bronzefunde I, 1) C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung: München.
- Segert, Stanislav
1984 *A Basic Grammar of the Ugaritic Language: With Selected Texts and Glossary.* University of California: Berkeley.
- Smith, Mark Stratton
1986 Interpreting the Baal Cycle. *UF* 18: 313-339.
1986a Baal in the Land of Death. *UF* 17: 311-314.
- Sollberger, Edmond
1986 *Administrative Texts Chiefly Concerning Textiles (L.2752).* (Archivi Reali di Ebla 8) Missione Archeologica Italiana in Siria: Rome.
- Spronk, Klaas
1986 *Beatific Afterlife in Ancient Israel and in the Ancient Near East.* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 219) Butzon & Bercker: Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- Stadelmann, Rainer
1967 *Syrisch-Palästinensische Gottheiten in Ägypten.* (Probleme der Ägyptologie 5) E.J. Brill: Leiden.
- Starcky, J.
1960 Une Tablette Araméenne de l'an 34 de Nabuchodonosor (AO, 21.063). *Syria* 37: 99-115.
- Starr, Omega Means
1984 An Apotropaic Incest Ritual in the Baal and Anath Cycle. *Folklore* 95: 231-234.
- Sukenik, Yigael
1947 The Composite Bow of the Canaanite Goddess Anath. *BASOR* 107: 11-15.
- Tadmor, Hayim, and Moshe Weinfeld (eds)
1983 *History, Historiography and Interpretation: Studies in Biblical and Cuneiform Studies.* Magnes Press: Jerusalem.
- Talon, Philippe
1985 *Textes Administratifs des salles «Y et Z» du Palais de Mari.* (Archives Royales de Mari 24) Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations: Paris.
- Tallqvist, L. Knut
1918 *Assyrian Personal Names.* (Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae 48/1) Helsingfors.
- Te Velde, H.
1977 *Seth, God of Confusion.* (Probleme der Ägyptologie 6, 2nd ed.) E.J. Brill: Leiden.
- Thomsen, Maric-Louise
1992 The Evil Eye in Mesopotamia. *JNES* 51: 19-32.
- Thureau-Dangin, F.
1937 Trois Contrats de Ras-Shamra. *Syria* 18: 245-255.

- Tufnell, Olga
1984 *Studies on Scarab Seals II: Scarab Seals and their Contribution to History in the Early Second Millennium BC.* (With contributions by G.T. Martin and William A. Ward) Aris & Phillips Ltd.: Warminster.
- Uphill, E.P.
1984 *The Temples of Per Ramesses.* Aris & Phillips Ltd.: Warminster.
- Van den Toorn, K.
1986 Herem-Bethel and Elephantine Oath Procedure. *ZAW* 98: 282-285.
- Van Dijk, J.
1986 'Anat, Seth and the Seed of Pre'. In Vanstiphout, Jongeling, Leemhuis and Reinink (eds), *Scripta Signa Vocis: Studies About Scripts, Scriptures, Scribes, and Languages in the Near East, Presented to J.H. Hospers by his Pupils, Colleagues, and Friends*, 31-51.
- Van Selms, Adrianus
1954 *Marriage and Family Life in Ugaritic Literature.* (Pretoria Oriental Series 1) Luzac & Company, Ltd: London.
1975 A Systematic Approach to CTA 5 i 1-8. *UF* 7: 475-482.
- Van Seters, John
1966 *The Hyksos: A New Investigation.* Yale University Press: New Haven.
- Van Soldt, W.H.
1989 The Ugaritic Word for 'Fly'. *UF* 21: 369-373.
- Van Zijl, Peter J.
1972 Translation and Discussion of Text 1001: 1-2 (RŠ. 15.134:1-2). *JNSL* 2: 74-85.
1972a *Baal. A Study of Texts in Connexion with Baal in the Ugaritic Epics.* (AOAT 10) Neukirchener Verlag: Neukirchen-Vluyn.
1974 Translation and Discussion of Text 1001: 3-5a (RŠ. 15.134:3-5a). *JNSL* 3: 85-93.
1975 Translation and Discussion of Text 1001: 5(b)-7 (RŠ. 15:134:5(b)-7). *JNSL* 4: 73-85.
- Vanstiphout, H.L.J., K. Jongeling, F. Leemhuis and G.J. Reinink (eds)
1986 *Scripta Signa Vocis: Studies About Scripts, Scriptures, Scribes, and Languages in the Near East, Presented to J.H. Hospers by his Pupils, Colleagues, and Friends.* Egbert Forsten: Groningen.
- Vincent, Albert
1937 *La Religion des Judéo-Araméens d'Eléphantine.* Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner: Paris.
- Virolleaud, Charles
1929 Les Inscriptions Cunéiformes de Ras Shamra. *Syria* 10: 304-310.
1931 Un Poème Phénicien de Ras-Shamra, La Lutte de Mot, Fils des Dieux, et d'Alein, Fils de Baal. *Syria* 12: 193-224.
1937 Etats Nominatifs et Pièces Comptables Provenant de Ras Shamra. *Syria* 18: 159-173.
1938 *La Déesse Anat: Poème de Ras Shamra.* P. Geuthner: Paris.
1940 Les Villes et les Corporations du Royaume d'Ugarit. *Syria* 21: 123-151.
1940-1941 Nouveaux Textes Administratifs de Ras Shamra. *RA* 37: 129-153.

- 1940-1941a Textes Administratifs de Ras-Shamra en Cunéiforme Alphabétique. *RA* 37: 11-44.
- 1941 Cinq Tablettes Accadienne de Ras-Shamra. *RA* 38: 1-12.
- 1951 Six Textes de Ras Shamra Provenant de la XIVe Campagne (1950). *Syria* 28: 163-179.
- 1960 Un Nouvel Episode du Mythe Ugaritique de Baal. *CRAIBL* 1960: 180-186.
- 1960a Le dieu Baal dans la mythologie d'Ugarit. *RHR* 161: 128-129.
- 1961 Un nouvel épisode du mythe ugaritique de Baal. *CRAIBL* 1960: 180-186.
- 1968 Les Nouveaux Textes Mythologiques et Liturgiques de Ras Shamra (XXIVe Campagne, 1961). *Ugaritica* 5: 545-606.
- Von Bissing, Fr. W. Freiherrn
1911-1914 *Denkmäler ägyptischen Skulptur*. F. Bruckmann A.-G.: München.
- Von Soden, Wolfram
1952 *Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik*. (Analecta Orientalia 33) Pontifical Biblical Institute: Rome.
- 1965-1981 *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*. Otto Harrassowitz: Wiesbaden.
- Walls, Neal H.
1992 *The Goddess Anat in Ugaritic Myth*. (SBLDS 135) Scholars Press: Atlanta, Georgia.
- Waltke, Bruce K. and M. O'Connor
1990 *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, Indiana.
- Ward, William A.
1969 La Déesse Nourricière d'Ugarit. *Syria* 46: 225-239.
- 1976 Some Personal Names of the Hyksos Period Rulers and Notes on the Epigraphy of their Scarabs. *UF* 8: 353-369.
- 1984 Royal-Name Scarabs. In Tufnell, *Studies on Scarab Seals II: Scarab Seals and their Contribution to History in the Early Second Millennium BC*, 151-192.
- Watson, Wilfred G.E.
1976 Puzzling Passages in the Tale of Aqht. *UF* 8: 371-378.
- 1977 Ugaritic and Mesopotamian Literary Texts. *UF* 9: 273-284.
- 1977a The Falcon Episode in the Aqhat Tale. *JNSL* 5: 69-75.
- 1978 Parallels to Some Passages in Ugaritic. *UF* 10: 397-401.
- 1984 *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to its Techniques*. (JSOT Supplement Series 26) JSOT Press: Sheffield.
- 1991 Two Similes in Aqht. *UF* 23: 359-360.
- Weinfeld, Moshe
1983 Divine Intervention in War in Ancient Israel and in the Ancient Near East. In Tadmor and Weinfeld (eds), *History, Historiography and Interpretation: Studies in Biblical and Cuneiform Studies*, 121-147.
- Wenham, Gordon J.
1972 *betûlah* 'A Girl of Marriageable Age'. *VT* 22: 326-348.
- Wente, Edward F.
1990 *Letters from Ancient Egypt*. (SBL Writings from the Ancient World 1) Scholars Press: Atlanta, Georgia.

- Whitaker, Richard E.
1972 *A Concordance of the Ugaritic Literature*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Wiggins, Steve A.
1991 The Myth of Asherah: Lion Lady and Serpent Goddess. *UF* 23: 383-394.
1993 *A Reassessment of 'Asherah': A Study According to the Textual Sources of the First Two Millennia B.C.E.* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 235) Verlag Butzon & Bercker Kevelaer: Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- Wilkinson, Richard H.
1991 The Representation of the Bow in the Art of Egypt and the Ancient Near East. *JANES* 20: 83-99.
- Wiseman, D.J. (ed.)
1973 *Peoples of Old Testament Times*. Clarendon Press: Oxford.
- Wyatt, Nicolas
1976 Atonement Theology in Ugarit and Israel. *UF* 8: 415-430.
1980 The Relationship of the Deities Dagan and Hadad. *UF* 12: 375-379.
1983 The Stela of the Seated God from Ugarit. *UF* 15: 271-277.
1984 The 'Anat Stela From Ugarit and its Ramifications. *UF* 16: 327-337.
1987 Who Killed the Dragon? *AuOr* 5: 185-198.
1987a Sea and Desert: Symbolic Geography in West Semitic Religious Thought. *UF* 19: 375-389.
1987b Echoes of the King and his Ka: an Ideological Motif in the Story of Solomon's Birth. *UF* 19: 399-404.
1988 The Source of the Ugaritic Myth of the Conflict of Ba'al and Yam. *UF* 20: 375-385.
1990 There and Back Again: The Significance of Movement in the Priestly Work. *SJOT* 1: 61-80.
1992 The Titles of the Ugaritic Storm-God. *UF* 24: 403-424.
- Xella, Paolo
1981 *I Testi Rituali de Ugarit - I.* (Publicazioni del Centro di Studio per la Civiltà Fenicia e Punica 21, Studi Semitici 54) Consiglio Nazionale Delle Ricerche: Roma.
- Yadin, Yigael
1963 *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands in the Light of Archaeological Discovery*. Weidenfeld and Nicolson: London.
- Yeivin, S.
1958 Note Sur une Pointe de Flèche Inscrite Provenant de la Beqaa (Liban). *RB* 65: 585-589.
- Yon, Marguerite
1991 *Arts et Industries de la Pierre*. (Ras Shamra Ougarit 6. Under the direction of M. Yon) Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations: Paris.
1992 Ugarit - The Urban Habitat: The Present State of the Archaeological Picture. *BASOR* 286: 19-34.
- Zadok, Ran
1986 Die Nichtebräischen Namen der Israeliten vor dem Hellenistischen Zeitalter. *UF* 17: 387-398.

Zorn, Jeffrey
1991

LÚ.PA-MA-HA-A in EA 162:74 and the Role of the MHR in Egypt and Ugarit.
JNES 50: 129-138.